

F. NASSERI

C.I.

THR

Feb 72

B.TOPORNIK, E.MACHULSKY

Socialism
and
Democracy
A Reply
to Opportunists



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian by *Nick Bobrov*

Edited by *Murad Saifulin*

Б. Н. ТОПОРНИН и Э. И. МАЧУЛЬСКИЙ
СОЦИАЛИЗМ И ДЕМОКРАТИЯ
(ОТВЕТ ОППОРТУНИСТАМ)

На английском языке

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	7
<i>Chapter I. STATE AND DEMOCRACY UNDER SOCIALISM</i>	20
1. Democracy and Opportunism	20
2. Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Objective Law of Socialist Democracy	28
3. Socialist Democracy as the Highest Form of Democracy	39
4. The Socialist State in the System of Socialist Democracy	54
<i>Chapter II. THE STATE, DEMOCRACY AND THE ECONOMY UNDER SOCIALISM</i>	72
1. The Economic Role of the Socialist State	72
2. "Non-Intervention" of the State in the Economy and Ownership under Socialism	85
3. "Market Socialism": Theory and Practice	92
4. Working People's Participation in Management	102
<i>Chapter III. THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND SOCIO-POLITICAL ORGANISATIONS</i>	117
1. Communist Party Leadership as an Objective Law of Socialist Construction	117
2. Forms and Methods of Communist Party Guidance	133
3. Mass Organisations	142
4. Socialism and the Multi-Party System	165
5. The Communist Party's Role in the Contemporary Development of Socialist Society	180
IN LIEU OF A CONCLUSION. SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION	188

First printing 1974

© Translation into English, Progress 1974

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

INTRODUCTION

World socialism is making rapid progress. The Soviet Union, which has been for over 50 years paving the way for mankind to realise its age-old ideals, is now in the vanguard of communist construction. Many other socialist countries, having established socialism, are now consistently implementing the new system's principles and building a fully developed socialist society. The Central Committee Report to the 24th CPSU Congress in 1971 said that "socialism, which is firmly established in the states now constituting the world socialist system, has proved its great viability in the historical contest with capitalism".¹ Time shows that the socialist social system has many historical advantages over capitalism. Lenin was correct in saying that socialism ushered in a new era in the history of mankind.

One of the main trends at the present stage of development of world socialism is the further development of the democratic principles of the social and state system and the search for more perfect forms and methods of social management. In recent years important and effective measures have been taken in the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries to ensure fuller implementation of Lenin's ideas on broad and efficient participation by the working masses in exercising political power in socialist society. These ideas, representing the basic directions in which socialist democracy can be extended, were developed in the documents

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1971, p. 9.

and materials of the 24th CPSU Congress, and recent congresses of other ruling Marxist-Leninist parties.

What is the essence of the changes that are taking place in the mechanism of people's rule in the socialist countries? Why is it that in these countries questions of democracy have come to be treated as questions of key importance to social development.

Socialist democracy has always been, right from the start, vastly superior to even the most developed "show-piece" models of bourgeois democracy. "It is the people, who even in the most democratic bourgeois republics, while possessing equal rights by law, have in fact been debarred by thousands of devices and subterfuges from participation in political life and enjoyment of democratic rights and liberties, that are now drawn into constant and unfailing, moreover, decisive, participation in the democratic administration of the state."¹

Fundamentally new traditions of democracy have developed under socialism, reflecting its depth, universality and reality. But the historical advantages of socialist democracy over bourgeois democracy do not remove or reduce the social need to further develop popular rule under socialism. This approach is not a propaganda device, as ideologists hostile to socialism are wont to contend. It is necessitated by the vital requirements and laws of social development inherent in the system itself. For Marxists-Leninists the development of democracy is primarily a question of bringing out the intrinsic qualities of socialist society and its opportunities, ensuring a high standard of living, the progress of science and culture, and all-round development of the human personality. The experience of world socialism clearly shows the dialectical interconnection and interdependence between democracy and economics, and between democracy and ideological and cultural life.

Socialism not only ensures the necessary material-technical and ideological basis for the development of democracy, it also presupposes the retroactive influence of democracy in relation to all spheres of social activity without exception. This retroactive influence of which the classics of Marxism-Leninism wrote is making itself felt more and more today. This is partly due to an increased relative independence of

the political-legal superstructure, which is developing according to both general and particular laws and is acquiring additional weight and authority in the life of society. Moreover, the course of socio-economic and cultural and scientific progress depends today as never before on the maturity of the forms of democracy which attend it.

Economic construction in the USSR and other fraternal socialist countries has increased considerably in scale and complexity. In accordance with the decisions of the recent congresses of the Communist and Workers' Parties of these countries a considerable rise in both industrial and agricultural output is envisaged under the current five-year plans. This will further strengthen the material and technical base of society, further raise the people's standard of living and produce more leisure time. But measures envisaged can only be actually accomplished provided there is constant, uninterrupted development and most effective application of the creative abilities of the working people, a truly conscientious and economical approach by them to the task in hand, and their active participation in economic management at all levels, from the basic economic unit to the entire national economy.

The socialist countries are now tackling tasks facing science, education and art on the basis of Marxist-Leninist ideology. They are developing science which is becoming a major productive force. Information is also coming to play a growing part in the life of society. All this promotes the further development of general cultural and political standards of the masses, enabling them to deal more knowledgeably with management and administration and social matters, and combine their experience with achievements in the theory and practice of government. At the same time, the wider scope of cultural development calls for the further democratisation of the state and the introduction of more efficient state, public-state and public forms of management of cultural development.

The new stage in the development of socialist democracy is closely related to the scientific and technological revolution, where results achieved depend very much on the level of training, awareness and organisation of the working people, their understanding of its place and significance in the development of society. Wide sections of the public (not just a chosen few) have a vital interest in the results of the

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 463.

scientific and technological revolution and indeed are its basic support, being directly involved in carrying out the transformations it requires in production and social life. But the scientific and technological revolution in its turn requires improvement and reorganisation of existing democratic forms and the elaboration of new democratic forms and methods of worker participation in government and economic management. The basic task formulated at the 24th CPSU Congress, to organically combine the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of socialism, undoubtedly represents an aspect of democracy.

Central to the process of developing socialist democracy in breadth and depth is the evolution of its class essence. The experience of the world socialist system clearly demonstrates the viability of the doctrine of dictatorship of the proletariat not only for the triumph of socialist revolution but for the building of developed socialist society too. At the same time, it has also shown that the historic mission of the dictatorship of the proletariat is exhausted with the creation of such a society, and the proletarian power evolves into a political organisation of the whole people, with the working class remaining the guiding force. Soviet society has already trod this path and is now working on the tasks of building communism. Socialist countries are steadily advancing along this path, many of them being currently engaged in solving the tasks of mature socialism. The leading and guiding role in the development of socialist democracy is played by the Marxist-Leninist parties.

In their activities to develop and extend the democratic basis of the socialist system, the Marxist-Leninist parties devote constant attention to creative study and application of their collective experience accumulated on a world-wide scale. The fraternal parties attach special importance to the experience of the CPSU, the trail-blazer of socialism and communism. The CPSU, in turn, greatly appreciates the creative contribution made to the treasury of Marxism-Leninism in other socialist countries. Mutual exchange of experience and collective enrichment of socialist theory and practice enable the USSR and other socialist countries to make more rapid progress along the course they have set.

The opportunities for creative exchange of experience are substantially increased as world socialism progresses. In the

wake of the USSR, more and more countries are accumulating knowledge in the sphere of the development and further improvement of the new system. The levels of socio-economic and cultural development are gradually drawing closer. New highly-qualified cadres have been trained in the various countries and are now successfully solving the most complicated tasks of social transformation. Many new tasks of economic construction, ideological life, and struggle for peace and security of the nations are being solved by socialist countries in similar conditions. Of no small importance is the fact that the laws and trends of social development reflected in the domestic and foreign policy of the socialist countries are better understood today.

Naturally, Marxists-Leninists carefully take into account the concrete historical specifics of each individual country, and firmly reject stereotyping and mechanical imitation. Not infrequently, when the socialist countries set out to solve a problem simultaneously and there is no previously tested model that can be employed, they adopt different means to achieve the same end. The development of world socialism by no means involves reducing the diversity of ways and means of socialist and communist construction to a single obligatory pattern. One has only to look at the course of state-legal development, which is marked by an inexhaustible wealth of forms and methods. But national features do not cancel or reduce the importance of the general regularities of development that are manifested in all spheres of social life, including the area of socialist democracy.

The strengthening of the position of socialism and its transformation into a decisive factor of world development accelerates mankind's progress. The consistent struggle of the USSR and the whole world socialist community for world peace and the triumph of the principles of humanism and democracy is of tremendous importance. The implementation of the Peace Programme endorsed at the 24th Congress of the CPSU and supported by other socialist countries and all progressive mankind is leading towards a relaxing of world tensions, the elimination of military conflicts and hotbeds of imperialist aggression, and is helping strengthen security in Europe and throughout the world. New, far more favourable conditions are being created for the exchange of ideas, which will undoubtedly bring in its wake an increase in the influence of socialist ideas and the impact of the prac-

tical achievements of socialism on people's minds, even those whose views are at present far-removed from Marxism-Leninism.

Various ideological opponents of socialism are expounding ideas and views designed to offset this natural, inevitable process. But as time goes by, they are finding it more and more difficult to launch direct attacks on the social system that resulted from the triumph of proletarian revolution. Life itself is making plainer and plainer for all to see the historic advantages of socialism over capitalism.

The main ideological adversary of socialism continues to be anti-communism, the platform of the enemies of social progress who suppress everything that is progressive and revolutionary. In an effort to whitewash capitalism imperialist reaction is trying to discredit socialism by bogus anti-communist slogans. Anti-communism is being spread through a ramified propaganda network of the monopolised mass media, and numerous "research" centres designed to denigrate Marxism-Leninism. But anti-communism is going ideologically and politically bankrupt.

The forces hostile to socialism are lending growing support to opportunism and seeking assistance from it. In his speech at an academic conference in Moscow, M. A. Suslov, Secretary of the CC CPSU, said: "The bourgeoisie is resorting to ideological subversion and is trying to use various revisionist vacillations in its own interest. We must take account of the fact that the political instability and ideological immaturity of the broad sections of the non-proletarian masses make themselves felt in connection with their growing involvement in the anti-imperialist struggle. This gives rise to various trends alien to Marxism-Leninism: 'Leftist' adventurism and the advocacy of anarchy, pretentious revolutionariness or conciliation. These trends increasingly resemble one another. Right and 'Left' opportunists are joining forces on the basis of anti-Sovietism, anti-communism, nationalism and the struggle against genuine socialism."¹

Opportunism, which has always attacked and slandered Marxism-Leninism, is now close to anti-communism. It is advancing many anti-communist "arguments" to split and

undermine the world socialist system and the international communist movement. Anti-communism and opportunism have established a kind of "common front", based on their hatred of the revolutionary teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin and of genuine socialism.

Opportunism is a Trojan horse in the world socialist camp and the international communist movement. It no longer simply adapts the interests of the working class in the capitalist countries to bourgeois interests, as was the case before the world socialist system came into being, but attacks socialism and helps its opponents, while pretending to adhere to socialism. Opportunism masks its fulminations against the new system by the wish to "improve" it and create a "humane model" or "national version" of socialism.

Right opportunism which reflects the bourgeois influence on the working class largely relies on the "labour aristocracy". In essence, this opportunism is continuing the policy of its predecessors, i.e., Fabians in Britain who at the turn of the century advanced the conception of the "evolution of capitalism into socialism" to oppose Marxism, and the renegades of German Social Democracy (Eduard Bernstein, Karl Kautsky and other revisionists) who distorted Marxist propositions by "revising" them. Right opportunists continue to impede the labour movement by waging a struggle for partially reforming the capitalist system; they oppose socialist revolution and tend to capitulate before the bourgeoisie on all issues.

The socialist cause is being threatened by "Left" opportunism, which disguises itself by "arch-revolutionary" slogans and ultra-radical phraseology and favours political and socio-economic gambles. No wonder the ideology and policy of Maoism—one of the most characteristic types of "Left" opportunism—fuses with the ideology and policy of imperialism. Imperialist ideologists and politicians continually laud Maoist arguments and activities, and use them against the forces of peace, democracy, social progress and socialism.

The petty-bourgeoisie and the declassed urban elements form the social base for "Left" opportunism, which is closely associated with dogmatism and nationalism now growing into hegemonism and chauvinism.

Although the basic provisions of Right and "Left" opportunism appear to diverge, both trends in essence over-

¹ *Pravda*, September 30, 1971.

lap politically and theoretically. History knows many cases when Right and "Left" opportunists have banded together against Marxism-Leninism and socialism. Immediately after the establishment of Soviet power in Russia, the Trotskyites joined forces with the Right elements to undermine the Leninist policy of socialist construction and Communist Party unity. Today, Right opportunists appear to support sectarianism and "Left" adventurism and dogmatism; the "Left" elements support Right anti-socialist forces. Right elements have often taken a "Left" stand and vice versa. Besides being unprincipled (a characteristic feature of the opportunists of all stripes), they all oppose Marxism-Leninism, deny the working class a key place in social development and its vanguard—the Communist Party—a leading part in the struggle for socialism and communism, trample on the principles of proletarian internationalism and gravitate towards nationalism and chauvinism. This shows that both Right and "Left" opportunism are socially akin and that they pursue the same ends in their ideological and political struggle.

Today, opportunism is an ideological and political motley, made up of various groupings, some of which are at loggerheads with one another. Many opportunists never belonged to the communist movement or subscribed to Marxism-Leninism. This is true, for example, of the Labour leaders in Britain. Opportunism permeates the programmes and activities of all the parties belonging to the Socialist International. In the Frankfurt Declaration of 1951 (which is Right Social Democracy's political credo to this day), the Socialist International called for reformist activities in capitalist society instead of its transformation along socialist lines.

Right and "Left" revisionists form a substantial part of the nucleus of contemporary opportunism. Formerly, they belonged to Communist Parties, but later renounced the fundamental principles of revolutionary theory, betrayed the socialist cause and openly began to oppose, ideologically and politically, Marxism-Leninism and the communist movement in general. The ideologists of contemporary opportunism include those who were expelled from the Communist Party, such as Roger Garaudy of France, Ernst Fischer of Austria, Teodoro Petkoff of Venezuela and the "Manifesto" group members in Italy. Several former Com-

munists from socialist countries have also sided with the opportunists; they include Ota Šik, Leszek Kolakowski, Milovan Djilas and Svetozar Stojanović. The so-called Left, which consists of a Maoist type of sectarian, dogmatic and adventuristic ideologists and the disciples of Herbert Marcuse and his ilk, holds an important place in opportunism.

Contemporary opportunists regard themselves as the champions of social progress and of an up-to-date philosophy based on the realities of the latter half of the 20th century. They substantiate their tenets by reference to the scientific and technological revolution; but instead of presenting a true, comprehensive analysis of the nature, cause and effect of the revolution in science and technology, they try to distort the meaning of the changes it brings in its train and to replace the concept of class struggle by the concept of the said revolution. They emphasise that the revolution is taking place in both the socialist and capitalist worlds, but make no mention of the fact that its achievements are used quite differently. Under capitalism, this revolution aggravates differences and contradictions between countries, increases unemployment, intensifies labour, lowers wages and gives rise to other adverse social factors. The framework of capitalist production relations is too narrow for the scientific and technological revolution. These relations emasculate the revolution and hinder its development. In the socialist countries, however, the revolution's balanced, overall development furthers social development.

Although many opportunists negate Marxism, there are some former Communists who still "favour" Marx and Lenin and use Marxist phraseology. They maintain they are only trying to "renew" and "supplement" outdated Marxist-Leninist teaching and are "looking for" new truths. This is what distinguishes contemporary revisionists from their predecessors who, echoing Eduard Bernstein, advocated a complete break with Marxism. In essence, however, the opportunist attitude to Marxism remains unchanged.

When contemporary opportunists declare their "loyalty" to Marxism, it is not the real Marx—the great founder of the proletarian teaching and strong opponent of the capitalist system—whom they have in mind, but an imaginary philosopher and humanist unconcerned with the intensifying class struggle. In their doctrines, the opportunists gloss over the

continuity and unity of Marxist tenets and their revolutionary and dialectical nature. Ernst Fischer's book, *Marx in His Own Words*, is a striking example of this.

The "Back to Marx" slogan and the search for the "real Marx" do not mean that changes are taking place in the opportunist camp. Only the tactics are changing, for the policy of breaking fully with Marxism has not justified itself. Marxism cannot now be openly opposed without risking utter defeat. The contemporary opportunists prefer to attack it under the guise of "defending" or "improving" it. Lenin once said that the "theoretical victory of Marxism compels its enemies to *disguise themselves* as Marxists".¹

The opportunists are trying to distort Leninism and belittle its significance. Some opportunists hold that Leninism is a specifically Russian, local teaching suitable only for backward agrarian areas of the world. Others deny Leninism's universal importance on the grounds that it was engendered by the conditions existing in Europe and the developed countries, and that therefore it cannot be effective in Asia. False arguments are advanced to show that Leninism deviates from Marxism, and attempts are made to "develop" Leninism, such as the ones to "renew" Marxism.

Contemporary opportunism differs from old opportunism in that it is more nationalistic and chauvinistic and denies the international importance of Leninism, the experience of both the proletarian revolution and socialist construction in the Soviet Union, and the experience collectively gained by the socialist countries.

The Resolution of the CC CPSU of February 21, 1972 says: "The imperialists are stoking the fire of racism and are trying to disunite various contingents of the working people nationally so as to split the international communist and workers' movement and suppress the national liberation movement. Bourgeois propaganda seeks to implant nationalist views in the minds of the peoples of the socialist countries and use nationalism to undermine the socialist system. The ideas of proletarian internationalism, friendship and fraternity between peoples must continually be disseminated, the hostile attempts to revive nationalist feelings and nationalist

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 584.

views must be politically assessed in time, and the ideologists of anti-communism, Right and 'Left' revisionism, nationalism and chauvinism must be exposed."¹

The General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Leonid Brezhnev, said at the 24th Party Congress that "it is precisely the nationalistic tendencies, especially those which assume the form of anti-Sovietism, that bourgeois ideologists and bourgeois propaganda have placed most reliance on in their fight against socialism and the communist movement".²

Opportunist ideologists attack many aspects of the socialist system, but their main target is socialist democracy and socialist polity and not just because socialism is most vulnerable in this field. Immediately after the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia, socialism's uncontested democratic gains convinced the world that it was superior to the bourgeois system. But the opportunists concentrate on the problems of power and administration under socialism for other reasons.

They know they will be able to channel socialist development into the Right or "Left" opportunist direction only when they assume power in socialist society. They could then mould or transform the economic system and ideological and spiritual life as they wished and conduct opportunistic domestic and foreign policies hostile to Marxism-Leninism and the principles of proletarian internationalism. The opportunists could thus undermine the world socialist community's cohesion. They, therefore, ideologically attack the socialist state, the mainstay of socialist democracy.

The struggle for and the consolidation of socialism require that the scientific and political inconsistency of opportunism be revealed and opportunist concepts and views be overcome. To relax the battle against opportunism and make concessions to the opportunists means playing into the hands both of Right reformists and "Left" adventurists, and of international reaction and imperialism.

The Communists attach paramount importance to the working-class unity and call for co-operation with the Socialist and Social Democratic parties which carry on their activ

¹ *The 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, 1972, p. 26 (in Russian).

² *24th Congress of the CPSU*, Moscow, 1971, p. 27.

ties in the interests of the workers' movement. Occasionally, Socialists and Communists pool their efforts and Left parties conclude agreements on various political alliances during a strike struggle and in the trade union movement in general. But the 12th Congress of the Socialist International, held in Vienna in late June 1972, shows that many differences exist in the Socialist International in respect of the Left forces' unity. At the Congress, such leaders of the Social Democratic parties as F. Mitterrand (France) and K. Sorsa (Finland) called for co-operation with the Communists at home and for better contacts with the CPSU and other Communist Parties of socialist countries, while the leaders of the Austrian Socialist Party and some other parties argued in favour of anti-communist propaganda and tended to distort the state of affairs in the countries of the socialist community.¹ The Right-wing leaders of the Socialist International, therefore, continue to carry on their ideological activities against communist principles and the idea that the two trends in the workers' movement should combine. The 24th CPSU Congress' conclusions on the relations with the Socialist parties thus remain important to this day. The Report of the CC to the 24th CPSU Congress said: "In accordance with the line laid down by the 1969 International Meeting, the CPSU is prepared to develop co-operation with the Social Democrats both in the struggle for peace and democracy, and in the struggle for socialism, without, of course, making any concessions in ideology and revolutionary principles.... Our Party has carried on and will continue to carry on an implacable struggle against any attitudes which tend to subordinate the working-class movement to the interest of monopoly capital, and to undermine the cause of the working people's struggle for peace, democracy and socialism."²

Besides assessing opportunism in political terms and disclosing the danger it poses to the world socialist cause, a correct analysis must be made of both the opportunist distortions of the forms and principles of socialist democracy and of the latest "models" and "national versions" of socialism so as

to reveal the reformist and Left-wing sectarian solution to the question of power in society. Moreover, one must show up the epistemological basis and the insolvency of the opportunist conceptions and views; they must be compared with the propositions of Marxism-Leninism, scientifically substantiated and tested in revolutionary practice. That is the purpose of this book.

¹ Y. Zhilin, "The Old and the New in the Socialist International's Policy", *Pravda*, August 22, 1972.

² 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 28.

STATE AND DEMOCRACY UNDER SOCIALISM

1. Democracy and Opportunism

Opportunism opposed socialist democracy even when the new social system's theoretical basis was being laid. Marx and Engels had had to go to great lengths to explain their theories and to defeat those distorting them and denying their importance. The opportunists attacked the socialist state system and socialist democracy in general after October 1917, when the proletarian revolution had triumphed in Russia and when the Russian Communist Party led by Lenin had begun to implement and develop the principles of scientific socialism. Like Karl Kautsky, leader of the German Social Democratic reformists, the opportunist ideologists openly slandered the democratic principles of socialism and opposed it with sham bourgeois democracy. In his work *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin roundly condemned the opportunists and showed up the utter inconsistency of their arguments.

Opportunism is suffering one crushing defeat after another today, when many countries that form a strong world socialist community are taking the socialist and communist road, and when socialist democracy clearly shows that it is superior to bourgeois democracy. But the opportunist ideologists are not giving up. They often criticise the capitalist system and bourgeois democracy and expose their ills, yet at the same time the Right-wing opportunists openly vilify socialism and its political system by maintaining that the latter is "totalitarian", that it entails "dictatorship of the Party" and that it gives "no civil liberties".¹ They advocate a "third road" of

¹ The documents of the last congress of the Socialist Party of Austria, especially the report of B. Kreisky, its chairman, show that the Social Democrats still use these methods of criticism to substantiate their "alternative" to communism. See *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, April 19, 1972.

development, which differs from capitalism and socialism in the Marxist-Leninist sense, and which, they claim, will rid mankind of all ills.

The principle of the "third road" of development exists in the conception of "democratic socialism", which is advocated by the Social Democratic parties in the capitalist countries and which forms the basis of the Socialist International's most important documents. Right opportunist elements have also tried to popularise this conception in some socialist countries. In 1968, the Right-wing forces in Czechoslovakia advocated it in the shape of "humane socialism" and "socialism with a human face".

Persons not well versed in politics might believe that "democratic socialism" means socialism and that it is even close to revolutionary Marxism-Leninism. But the demagogic concerning socialism, democracy and social harmony that permeates the Right opportunists' preambles of declarations, statements and programmes shows that they do not have a truly scientific, Marxist-Leninist understanding of the processes of world development, and that they take a reformist view of socialism and renounce the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist system. A prominent leader of the Socialist International, Julius Braunthal, has said that "until ... the First World War ... Marxism was the predominant ideology of the Second International", and that now "it is the theory of evolutionary socialism and not revolutionary Marxism which guides these endeavours (towards a socialist order of society).—Ed.)".²

Being amorphous, "democratic socialism" draws on various philosophical views. The Declaration adopted by the Socialist International in Frankfurt-on-Main says: "(Democratic) socialism is an international movement which does not demand a rigid uniformity of approach. Whether Socialists build their faith on Marxist or other methods of analysing society ... they all strive for the same goal.")²

Even the social-reformists who "support" Marx and his analysis of capitalist economy and class structure reject his propositions on the need for a proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Austrian Socialist Karl

¹ *Socialist International Information*, May 11, 1968, Vol. XVIII, No. 9, p. 100.

² *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement*, 1956-1957, London, 1956, p. 41.

Czernetz, speaking of the attitude of Socialist parties towards Marxism, said at the Utrecht Conference of the Socialist International that there should be no veneration of it. Those who fully renounce Marxism are more outspoken in their views. The Swiss Socialist, Arnold Künzli, has said quite frankly that "as a universal theory of socialism, Marxism is reactionary today".¹

In essence, the proponents of "democratic socialism" defend capitalism ideologically. They replace the Marxist-Leninist dialectics of social development by primitive evolutionism, call for only quantitative changes and partial reforms of the capitalist system instead of its revolutionary transformation. They hold that socialist society must have capitalism's socio-economic and political basis and that the aspirations of the working people in the capitalist countries can be realised without a socialist revolution, the smashing of the old, capitalist machine and a new, proletarian state. They maintain that the economic and political system destroyed by the revolution should be re-established in a society where socialism is being successfully built on Marxist-Leninist principles.

The social-reformists no longer call for nationalisation of the principal means of production, formerly demanded by the Social Democrats. They make an apology for state-monopoly capitalism and call for the establishment of a "mixed economy" as a stage in the transition from capitalism to socialism.

But this conception of "democratic socialism" is obviously wrong. When political power and most of the means of production belong to monopoly capital, the partial nationalisation of the economy as a way of developing state-monopoly capitalism cannot change the nature of capitalist production relations. With partial nationalisation the unprofitable economic sectors are chiefly nationalised, and the former owners are given considerable compensation. This puts the working people, at whose expense all the costs are covered, into serious difficulties.

"Democratic socialism" is reformist as is evident from the stand taken by its proponents towards the capitalist state and bourgeois democracy. Right opportunist theorists renounce the concepts of class struggle, gloss over the irreconcilable

contradictions between the exploiters and the exploited under capitalism and thus advocate "social partnership", "civil peace" and "equality of workers and employers". They regard the capitalist state as a supraclass political organisation which expresses and defends in equal measure the interests of all classes and social strata, and which is used by them to gradually transform capitalism into socialism. They hold that bourgeois parliamentary democracy is "complete democracy" and that the working class is integrated into its system; accordingly, the working class "grows into" the political system of the capitalist society, taking its share of responsibility for its development.

They either conceal or distort the fact that the capitalist state is now a bastion of the monopolies' political and economic rule, which bourgeois democracy disguises, protects and consolidates. In the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism the monopolies, frightened by the powerful impact of socialist ideas and the enormous scale of the class struggle, try to restrict the working people's democratic rights and freedoms as much as possible and to create conditions that would allow them to resort to fascist and other reactionary methods of administration when danger really threatens their positions.

The proponents of "democratic socialism" seek to adapt their conception to the specific conditions of particular countries. They modify it to influence the minds of working people in capitalist and socialist countries, especially where socialist construction is not yet completed and where society has not reached the level of fully developed, mature socialism. They often advance nationalistic slogans and contend that they continue the ideas that once had a strong influence on the minds of working people. The Right-wing opportunist ideologists try to penetrate the communist movement and operate under the guise of Party members.

The Right-wing opportunists were the implacable enemies of people's power in Hungary. The group of Imre Nagy and Géza Losonczy played on the mistakes made by the leadership of the country in the 1950s and openly attacked the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist construction. When they assumed power, they carried out anti-socialist measures under the pretext of "rectifying mistakes". Imre Nagy regarded the socialist economic sector as a state-capitalist sector, and actually favoured the disbandment of

¹ Die Neue Gesellschaft No. 5, 1969, S. 510.

agricultural co-operatives and the return of land to rich peasants. He and his group believed that their social support lay with the middle urban sections and the peasants, and opposed them to the working class. The Right-wing deviationists wanted to rally all the anti-popular elements—from the revisionists to the Horthyists and Nihilists—under the slogans of “national communism”.

The proponents of “national communism” mainly attacked the workers’ power, which Imre Nagy regarded as “degenerate Bonapartist power” that had to be forcibly overthrown. At first they alleged that they aspired to “socialist democracy” but then called for the establishment of “pure democracy”, i.e., the re-establishment of capitalism. The Right-wing opportunists eroded the Party from within, obstructed the socialist state in its activities and split the forces supporting people’s democracy.

“National communism” was counter-revolutionary because it was motivated by reactionary forces and paved the way for a reactionary uprising. During the trying days of October 1956, Imre Nagy and his supporters went to great lengths to prevent the healthy forces in the Party and the country from defending people’s power. They helped to consolidate the political positions of this power’s enemies and acted in collusion with reactionary circles. They found a common language with the anti-popular Hungarian émigrés, who had close ties with the intelligence services of the imperialist states. But the counter-revolutionaries were defeated and the revolutionary forces consolidated, thus saving the country’s socialist gains.

The 1968 events in Czechoslovakia clearly show the danger which Right opportunism poses to socialism. Although the events were peaceful, and there was no civil war or armed counter-revolutionary uprising owing to the activities carried on by the healthy core of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the international assistance rendered by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, Right-wing forces in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, having banded together with all anti-socialist groupings, openly attacked the socialist system in an effort to destroy the people’s revolutionary gains. They did this under the slogans of “humane socialism” and “socialism with a human face”, their conceptions basically reproducing reformist “democratic socialism”.

The anti-socialist forces in Czechoslovakia (which were supported and inspired by Western imperialist circles) tried hard to destroy the mechanism of socialist political rule and set up their own political system, which was to restore the status quo prior to February 1948. The new regime was to include elements of the pre-Munich bourgeois republic. The main blow fell on the Communist Party, which began to lose its effectiveness and Marxist-Leninist nature under revisionist onslaught. The Right forces paralysed the state bodies’ activities, as a result of which the most important executive and legislative bodies gradually stopped playing their class role within the political system. Since the army and the judicial and state security bodies had been seriously weakened, they could not oppose the growing counter-revolution. The Right opportunists tried hard to make the National Front a political association that would renounce the Communist Party’s leading role. The Club of non-Party Activists, and Club-231—new organisations with a patent anti-socialist programme and direct links with the Western anti-communist centres—entered the political arena.

The events in Czechoslovakia once again have shown how Right opportunism tries to emasculate socialist democracy of its revolutionary and class content by “improving”, “democratising” and “humanising” socialism and to restore bourgeois political and economic power. To achieve its anti-socialist ends, it adopts pro-bourgeois views, establishes overt and covert alliances with political counter-revolutionary forces and enables them to carry on their activities. It also plays on nationalist feelings and capitalises on the difficulties that occasionally occur in relations between socialist countries.

A striking example of these trends in Yugoslavia was the Milovan Djilas group, which attacked the principles of socialist democracy from a petty-bourgeois, anarcho-syndicalist standpoint. Djilas called for an end to the leading part played by the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) and by the working class; he advocated the establishment of a bourgeois type of multi-party system, and advanced the idea of a “new exploiter class”, which included both economic administrators and the officials of Party and state bodies. Djilas was subsequently expelled from the LCY for his anti-socialist and petty-bourgeois views.

In an effort to spread ideas of reactionary-utopian and “barrack-room socialism”, “Left” opportunists distort the

Marxist-Leninist theory of socialist democracy. The danger posed to the socialist cause has been strongly felt in recent years. These opportunists use ultra-revolutionary phraseology as a cover to urge the people to resort to adventurism and prompt the Party to embark on a sectarian path.

When the leadership of the country and of the Party takes a "Leftist" stand, as in China, "Left" revisionist theory is translated into opportunist practice which has nothing in common with socialist construction. The replacement of scientific communism by Mao Tse-tung's vulgar and basically anti-revolutionary dogmas meant the complete revision of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state and democracy; similarly, the main Chinese political institutions, established during the first years of people's power, were either destroyed or reorganised.

The Maoists do not believe in the people's creative power and try to subordinate the entire society to state control. This policy has not been discovered by them; it is true of "Left" revisionism ever since the time of Trotsky, one of its first theorists, who held that the socialist state should play a "special" role. He maintained that all political and mass organisations, including the Party and the trade unions, be "governmentalised", and regarded the workers' ruling vanguard as the master of society. The peasantry was, for him, the workers' enemy and, therefore, the state should be strengthened through ruining the peasants. Trotsky argued that sheer administration and open coercion were the main methods of state guidance: the state machinery should be organised along army lines. His proposals on organising economic and cultural administration were all based on militarisation.

Trotsky contended that the socialist state was not governed by the objective laws of the new society's construction and that "revolutionary will" was all-powerful. This provision, which, undoubtedly, had an impact on Maoism, was the basis of Trotskyite efforts to impose on the Party a policy of "skipping" over the necessary stages of economic construction. The terminology and adventurist spirit of Trotskyism have received a new lease of life in the theory and practice of Maoism.

Maoism, however, does not directly continue or borrow Trotskyite conceptions. First, Trotskyism is the main, but not the only source of Maoism, which eclectically combines

various conceptions, views, doctrines and theories. It includes Chinese feudal philosophy, petty-bourgeois socialism, especially Proudhonism, the Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries' views on the key role of the peasantry in the revolution, and anarchism which disregards the constructive role of the socialist state in society and inflates the role played by the individual in history. (Mao Tse-tung himself admitted that he took a keen interest in anarchism when it was very popular in China in the 1920s.) Second, when various "Leftist" deviations are compared with Maoism, account must be taken of their common social nature, i.e., their petty-bourgeois roots which nourish these anti-Marxist views at various stages of the communist movement. The class basis of the "Leftist" trends is the petty bourgeoisie, which makes up the bulk of the population in such countries as contemporary China and which predominated in pre-revolutionary Russia. "Ultra-revolutionary" slogans that call for immediate socio-economic changes easily sway the petty bourgeoisie, which has no proletarian experience and discipline and gravitates towards anarchism. Third, Trotskyism, mainly, has revised the theory of socialism. Maoism—"Leftist" revisionism, reduced to absurdity and expressed in Chinese state policy—is a rabid adversary of scientific communism in theory and of socialism in practice.

Maoism is a reflection of the struggle for socialism waged under the complex conditions of China, a vast country with a large population that is backward socially, economically, politically and culturally owing to the long domination of foreign capital, the compradore bourgeoisie and the landowners. Maoism emerged and developed under the impact of peasant psychology and peasant spontaneity, stamped by feudal and semi-feudal relations and deep-rooted Confucianism, which taught implicit obedience to the authorities and blind submission to high-ranking officials.

Maoism and the Chinese peasant ideology are not directly connected; the connection is intricate and contradictory, especially when account is taken of the social heterogeneity and dual nature of the peasantry, which gravitates towards the workers as its natural ally in the struggle against exploitation, but which is yoked by prejudices, backwardness and petty-bourgeois narrow-mindedness. Maoism is dependent on peasant ideology because it is a petty-bourgeois, nationalist socio-political trend.

2. Dictatorship of the Proletariat: Objective Law of Socialist Democracy

The opportunists renounce and falsify Marxism-Leninism, as can be seen from the way they approach the establishment and development of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Right and "Left" opportunist ideologists distort the views of Marx and Lenin, counterpose them and slander the policies of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. They maintain that proletarian dictatorship is incompatible with democracy, declare it to be outdated and distort it so that it implies a system of power which has nothing in common with socialist principles.

Right opportunist ideologists often hold that Marx "mentioned" the dictatorship of the proletariat accidentally and that later he attached no importance to it. They maintain that it conflicts with young Marx's humanism and that Lenin "deviated" from Marxism when he substantiated and developed this concept in the 20th century. Accordingly, the individual is not free under the dictatorship of the proletariat, which establishes no "national unity" and aggravates class contradictions.¹ This is an echo of the slanders by Eduard Bernstein and Karl Kautsky. In a series of articles called *Problems of Socialism*, Eduard Bernstein wrote at the end of the last century that socialism (which he regarded as a moral and ethical ideal, and not as a socio-economic formation to replace capitalism) could be established merely by educating members of society for which, he held, it was enough to make partial reforms in the bourgeois democratic system, and that the dictatorship of the proletariat need not be established. In the pamphlet *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, published in 1918, Karl Kautsky wrote that there could be no democracy under any class dictatorship.

Today, the opportunists are marking time. A publication of the Socialist International says: "Democratic Socialists have nothing politically in common with the representatives of dictatorship. They make no distinction between good and bad dictatorships, but reject all dictatorship without exception.... Dictatorship remains dictatorship, always meaning

¹ See D. A. Kerimov, Y. M. Chekharin, *Socialist Democracy and the Contemporary Ideological Struggle*, Moscow, 1970, p. 12 et al (in Russian).

the loss of freedom by the individual."¹ The Basic Programme of the Social Democratic Party of Germany says: "We resist all dictatorship, every form of totalitarian or authoritarian rule because they violate human dignity, destroy man's freedom and the rule of law."²

In many of his works, including *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, Lenin castigated the opportunists for distorting the theory and practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The long existence of the socialist state system in many countries shows that the propositions which Lenin advanced immediately after the establishment of the Soviet state are correct and that the Right opportunist conceptions are false.

Marx himself did not regard the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat as something inconsequential. On the contrary, he said that it was the result of his study of the workers' struggle and the core of the revolutionary teaching on society. In his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, he developed his earlier formulation of the dictatorship of the proletariat by saying: "Between capitalist and communist society lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. Corresponding to this is also a political transition period in which the state can be nothing but the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."³

In the new historical conditions of transition to socialism, Lenin defended and developed the Marxist concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat and created a coherent teaching of the principles, forms and means of this dictatorship. He showed that it was a *sine qua non* for establishing and developing the socialist system.

This dictatorship is needed mainly to break down the resistance offered by the remnants of the overthrown exploiting classes and their accomplices and to frustrate actions of all anti-socialist forces. The experience gained in the socialist countries shows that reaction does not reconcile itself to defeat, but tries to preserve itself and then strengthen its

¹ *Socialist International Information*, Sept. 21, 1968, No. 16-17, pp. 190-191.

² *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement, 1960-1961*, Vol. 2, London, 1960, p. 138.

³ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works* (in three volumes), Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 26.

forces by various stratagems and ruses so as to attack the working-class power and the socialist system at an opportune moment and revert social development to capitalism. Only the proletarian dictatorship can foil counter-revolutionary actions and guarantee peaceful conditions for the constructive work of building developed socialism. Lenin wrote: "The dictatorship of the proletariat means a persistent struggle—bloody and bloodless, violent and peaceful, military and economic, educational and administrative—against the forces and traditions of the old society."¹

Former capitalists, landowners and rich peasants are not exterminated when socialist production relations are established and the exploiting classes as such are eliminated. A large number of exploiters who opposed state power in Soviet Russia, where the dictatorship of the proletariat was established during an intense class struggle, perished during the intervention, the civil war and the kulak uprisings, and many counter-revolutionaries fled the country. This was not the case in other socialist countries. When the people's democracy was established, many former big owners emigrated to the West. But a substantial number of former exploiters and reactionaries stayed behind. This was of special importance in the former developed capitalist countries.

Western imperialist circles support the remnants of the exploiter classes within socialist states by systematic ideological subversion, by increasing co-operation between the political counter-revolutionary centres with the imperialist intelligence services, by giving financial backing to the reactionary émigrés and co-ordinating the various anti-socialist groupings' efforts. International imperialism regards the remnants of internal counter-revolution as its direct agents in the socialist world, but it does its best to cover this up.

The class opponents offered stronger resistance to socialist development in Soviet Russia (where, as Lenin said, "we had to exercise the dictatorship of the proletariat in its harshest form"²) than in the other socialist countries. The repressive measures taken in the latter were, therefore, not as stringent as those in Soviet Russia; the political rights of the former exploiters did not have to be limited and other

measures taken in Soviet Russia did not have to be carried out at all. The kulaks, and, in some countries, part of the middle bourgeoisie, took part in economic development and political life. The experience gained in the socialist countries shows that the proletariat is not interested in intensifying suppression where there is no need to do so. The existing situation and mainly the anti-socialist forces' organisational efficiency and the strength of their resistance determine the scale of suppressive measures to be taken.

The proletarian dictatorship implies not only or chiefly coercion. It is intended for building and developing socialism by tackling various constructive problems. When the socialist system has been established, socialist social relations have to be developed in the economic, political and ideological fields.

Experience shows that the workers' state must carry on various painstaking activities for a fairly long time to complete the construction of socialism even in countries which started this construction from a relatively high economic level.

The state of proletarian dictatorship tackles the following tasks involved in bringing socialist production relations to a full maturity: boosting production on the basis of scientific and technical achievements, introducing new, more advanced forms of planning and management, improving labour discipline and the workers' skills, developing their creative endeavour and abilities, industrialising and mechanising farm labour and creating new forms of co-operation between town and country. At that stage, the socialist principles of distribution are realised ever more fully and the two main forms of socialist property (state and co-operative property) create prerequisites for their gradual merger into the property of the entire people.

The dictatorship of the proletariat has to carry out difficult and responsible tasks in the sphere of class relations. The working class' alliance with all non-proletarian classes and sections of the working people, the peasantry above all, must be consolidated so as to build fully developed socialism. In this alliance, the working class must continue to play a key role. The growing socialist intelligentsia plays an increasingly important part in the country's life. Workers' power enables the society to overcome the essential distinctions between town and country and between mental and physical

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 44.

² Ibid., Vol. 28, p. 207.

labour, and helps to make the society fully homogeneous in a social respect.

The state of proletarian dictatorship organises and guides all the ideological and educational work in society and consolidates its ideological basis on Marxist-Leninist principles. When socialism is being developed, the new generation has to be educated, its socialist consciousness has to be strengthened, Marxist-Leninist convictions have to be firmly implanted, and people who formerly held outspoken anti-socialist or pseudo-socialist views have to be re-educated in a socialist spirit. Account must also be taken of the fairly strong influence of the reactionary clergy in some countries. The subversive propaganda which is continually spread by imperialist special services and their media in the West makes it difficult to carry on ideological work among the masses.

Workers' power remains until developed socialism is built so as to improve and strengthen the political system of society and consolidate the principles of socialist democracy. At the stage, the principles of public self-administration are developed further, and more and more people take part in running the state, the economy and public affairs. State forms continue to be the main forms of democracy, but the working people's social organisations play an increasingly important part, thus paving the way for the transition from the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat to that of the entire people. Meanwhile, workers' power helps to consolidate the fraternal cooperation of socialist countries, defend world socialism from imperialist schemes and aggression, render assistance to the national liberation movement and newly independent countries, and pursue a policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-economic systems. In recent years, economic ties between the member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance have increased and socialist economic integration has developed more successfully.

The dictatorship of the proletariat evolves into socialist democracy of the entire people as socialist construction is completed and communist construction begins.

The CPSU Programme says that when socialism is fully established and when communist construction commences, the state of proletarian dictatorship becomes the state of the entire people in which the working class plays a key role and

expresses the will and interests of all classes and social strata of society.¹

Other socialist countries have also embarked on this path. According to the Bulgarian Communist Party Programme, the workers' state will outgrow into a state of the entire people, i.e., it will become a "body which, under working-class guidance, will express the entire people's will and interests".² Numerous problems of building developed socialism have to be solved, however, in a lengthy process.

When socialism triumphs completely and when the entire nation firmly takes a socialist stand, the working class, allied with the co-operated peasantry and the working intelligentsia, intensifies its struggle against international imperialism. Under these circumstances, power in society represents the organisation of the entire people that functions under the guidance of the working class.

The dictatorship of the proletariat and the organisation of the entire people under the leadership of the working class, are the two main stages in the development of the socialist political and legal system. Each of these stages has its own forms and means of exercising power. But they are not separate from each other, since even in its embryonic state the dictatorship of the proletariat developed features that are most clearly displayed under the socialist democracy of the entire people. The dictatorship of the proletariat is the working-class power which is exercised together with all the working people and which applies force against its class opponents. The polity of the entire people entails the working people's organisation headed by the working class and its Party on the basis of their authority and universal recognition. The democracy of the proletarian dictatorship fully blossoms in the state of the entire people. The growth of the proletarian dictatorship into a political organisation of the entire people in which the working class plays the leading role is a process which consummates only under developed socialism.

The documents of the Tenth Congress of the Socialist Workers' Party of Hungary (1970), the Tenth Congress of the Communist Party of Bulgaria (1971), the 14th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (1971) and the

¹ *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, 1962, p. 453.

² *Rabotnicheskoe delo*, April 29, 1971.

8th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (1971), all describe state power in these countries as the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the Tenth Party Congress, the First Secretary of its CC János Kádár said that state power in Hungary is working-class power. The experience of the socialist countries shows that the dictatorship of the proletariat must exist until the main processes of establishing a fully developed, mature socialist society are completed. This is borne out by analysis of the socio-economic, political and ideological factors determining social life at a given historical stage.

Today, the world situation promotes socialist development and creates better conditions than existed in Soviet Russia for the dictatorship of the proletariat to grow over, more rapidly and easily, into a political organisation of the entire people under the working-class guidance. Socialism has become much more attractive and has more patently shown its superiority and efficiency. The socialist system uses better and more effective forms of social management and creates conditions for furthering the scientific and technological revolution. The Soviet Union gives every possible assistance to other socialist countries. Socialist economic integration accelerates economic development in all CMEA countries, both the industrially developed and formerly backward countries.

It would be theoretically wrong and practically harmful to ignore the factors which indicate the period during which the dictatorship of the proletariat fully grows into a political organisation of the entire people. These include the development of the society's class structure, particularly the differences in the positions that individual social classes hold and in their behaviour; the firmness of the working class' alliance with the other working people; the potential strength of the remnants of the overthrown classes; the state of ideological life in the society, specifically, the effectiveness of the struggle of Marxism-Leninism against opportunism, reformism, revisionism and nationalism; the international situation, and other internal and external factors.

In the Soviet Union, the transition from the state of the proletarian dictatorship to the state of the entire people lasted from the mid-1930s to the early 1960s. This is the road also taken by other socialist countries where developed socialism is being built with due account of their national specific

features and historical traditions, but where the political system is still based on the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The working class enjoys ever greater authority in society when the dictatorship of the proletariat develops into a political organisation of the entire people. At the new stage of social development, too, it continues to be in the vanguard of the struggle for socialism and communism as a leading force of society.

In their recent works, opportunist ideologists have written that the changed social conditions, above all the revolution in science and technology, have either nullified or outdated the Marxist-Leninist tenets on the part the working class plays in society. They have said that owing to the increasing mechanisation and automation of production and computerisation and the higher level of production management the working class has to be removed from key administrative positions because it is an "incompetent" and even "inert" class, and power must be concentrated in the hands of the "socialist managers", the technocrats who take no part in politics and who do not subscribe to Marxism-Leninism.

The authors of such conceptions deliberately distort present-day socialist society and ignore the results and trends of its development. The workers' role does not, in fact, diminish even when the number of intellectuals increases and they play a greater part in science, technology, culture, education and other social fields. Today, with increasing industrial development and greater scientific and technological progress, the workers rise to a higher general educational and vocational level and become more organised and conscious. The working class is the most advanced section of society, vitally interested in developing the progressive trends in society's economic, political and cultural life.

In the socialist countries, the working class has consolidated its authority by being loyal to communist ideals and by resolutely overcoming all difficulties. It continues to be the mainstay of socialist power. Historical experience has shown that the leading role of the working class is the most important prerequisite for successfully building socialism and communism.

Occasionally, illusions have been created and exaggerated assessments of the economic and especially political and ideological successes have been made when socialism was

declared to be fully established in society. The General Secretary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Gustav Husák, has said that all the main problems of the transition from capitalism to socialism were regarded as being solved when socialist production relations were declared to be established (from the standpoint of the forms of ownership).¹ Without studying the situation in Czechoslovakia in the early 1960s, when the foundations of socialism were laid and when the exploiting classes no longer existed, some people contended that the main problems of the proletarian dictatorship had been already solved in the republic and that it rapidly began to grow over into a political organisation of the entire people. Some held that socialist construction had to be completed actually in the state of the entire people.

Opportunist ideologists began to challenge the historical need of the dictatorship of the proletariat and tried to capitalise on the mistakes made in understanding both the stages of socialist construction and the essence of power at each stage. They held that the establishment of workers' power in Central and Southeast Europe was a "historical error" and that the coalition governments, which existed in several countries at the beginning of the revolution, fully met the requirements there. The dictatorship of the proletariat was allegedly unnecessary and even harmful, for it "destroyed" the "national unity" and "class harmony" and "suppressed" the "society's healthy forces". The proponents of such "theories" virtually echoed the outspoken apologists of capitalism and bourgeois democracy in their slander of workers' power.

The latest theories advanced by the ideological and theoretical opponents of Leninism naturally hold no water. The power that is publicised as a "missed happy opportunity" was in fact the embryo of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was established at the initial democratic, anti-imperialist and, in several countries, anti-feudal stage of the revolution, and by its class nature it was the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working people. The working class played the leading part in this dictatorship since it was established; the bourgeoisie never played a determining part in it. On the contrary, its role invariably diminished.

¹ *Rudé právo*, May 26, 1971.

The workers took account of the real balance of social forces and established an alliance with part of the bourgeoisie so as to isolate and quickly defeat the former ruling class elite which had held the commanding heights in society. But this was a temporary alliance, for revolutionary development aggravated the irreconcilable contradictions between the working people and the bourgeoisie which, being forced to establish the alliance, tried to use its power to slow down the revolutionary process and ultimately restore capitalism.

The revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working people, based on a militant worker-peasant alliance, was itself a transitional power whose development depended on the revolution. The victorious socialist revolution inevitably led to the establishment of the undivided dictatorship of the proletariat. The defeat of the revolution would have re-established the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. There was no third way.

Under the working-class guidance, the working people defeated their political opponents and settled the key question of power in the revolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat was necessary in the countries of Central and Southeast Europe, as it once was in Soviet Russia, although the revolutions in these countries differed from the October Socialist Revolution because they peacefully grew from the first stage to the second, the class struggle was less intense and the political forces were less sharply stratified. Moreover, they were influenced by the changed world balance of power between socialism and capitalism. Lenin said in this respect: "Forward development, i.e., advance towards communism, proceeds through the dictatorship of the proletariat, and cannot do otherwise, for the resistance of the capitalist exploiters cannot be *broken* by anyone else or in any other way."¹

The working class plays a decisive part in uniting all nations and nationalities in the struggle against capitalist exploitation, for social emancipation and national liberation. This unity, based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, is a prerequisite for a victorious revolution in multinational states, for the transformation of society on socialist lines, and the progress of the backward peoples' economy

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 461.

and culture. Under the Communist Party's guidance, the working class of Russia was the first to oppose class and national oppression, national strife and isolation, and bourgeois and nationalist ideology in all its forms. It counterposed the new world, where workers are united, where there are no human and national exploitation and national privileges, to the old world.¹

The Soviet experience of solving the national question has been used by such countries as Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia to set up socialist federations and by all the socialist multinational states. The principles of voluntary consent, equality, fraternal friendship, mutual assistance, democratic centralism, proletarian internationalism and socialist democracy underlie the national relations in the socialist countries, the freedom and progress of every nation and the socialist community as a whole. The dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the main vehicle of peoples' solidarity and unity in socialist and communist construction, makes it possible to apply these principles correctly and consistently.

Like Right opportunists, the "Left" dogmatists and sectarians have also deviated from the Marxist-Leninist teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Maoism shows that it misunderstands the Leninist teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat, distorts and replaces it by incorrect, contradictory views on the essence of political power in society at various stages of the revolution. Maoism underestimates the proletariat's role, belittles its revolutionary potential, exaggerates the peasant's revolutionary qualities, and virtually revises Lenin's teaching of the working-class leading role in contemporary society and the need to establish the proletarian dictatorship during the transition from capitalism to socialism. Maoism has replaced the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat by that of the dictatorship of the people; this means that the proletariat has been relegated to the background and dissolved in the general mass of people who blindly follow the ruling group.

The Maoist leadership carefully disguises its petty-bourgeois nature and manoeuvres between various classes, social strata and social groups. These tactics help to draw heterogeneous and politically unstable elements to the Maoists'

side. The Maoists seek to pass off their selfish interests as those of the entire people and advance nationalist aims as a binding factor, as a force standing above classes. The "cultural revolution" has shown that the Maoists played up to the people and carried out wide-scale suppression to turn individual social groups and strata into a pliant tool for crushing political opponents and realising hegemonic aspirations. This characterises all types of "Leftist" opportunism.

3. Socialist Democracy as the Highest Form of Democracy

Today, the opportunist ideologists do more than renounce and distort the Marxist-Leninist conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They try to discredit it as "anti-democratic", "totalitarian", and as a "military and bureaucratic regime". They oppose it by their own concept of democracy, which is a far cry from genuine socialism. Right and "Left" opportunists widely employ the concept of democracy in their struggle against scientific socialism, established in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. The concept has long been the object of many opportunist falsifications and speculations.

The opportunists try to confuse the issue of democracy, slur over the basic difference between socialist and bourgeois concepts of democracy, and conceal or belittle the importance of the gains of the proletarian revolution. Hence the allegations that democracy cannot exist under the dictatorship of the proletariat, that the collective and society suppress the personality, that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the dictatorship of the Communist Party, and so on. The Venezuelan traitor to the communist movement, Teodoro Petkoff, seriously discusses the need to "return (*sic!*) power to the working class in the socialist countries".¹ The revisionist "theorist", Svetozar Stojanović, says that the working class in the Soviet Union "does not enjoy the rights which the working class enjoys under capitalism".²

Opportunist ideologists advance various concepts in place of socialist democracy. The bourgeois myths of the "welfare state" and "industrial" or "post-industrial society", and the

¹ *The 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, Moscow, pp. 5-6 (in Russian).

² *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 10, 1970, p. 113.

² S. Stojanović, *Izmedu idealja i stvarnosti*, Beograd, 1969, str. 56.

pseudo-Marxist ideologists' political models of socialism, show that new attractive slogans are being used to reproduce the capitalist political structure. Opportunism's "third road" is in fact designed to improve bourgeois democratic principles.

Marxism-Leninism does not deny that, historically, bourgeois democracy played a progressive role, since freedom of the individual and the formal equality of citizens were first proclaimed in the early period of capitalism, putting an end to feudal privileges and the peasants' dependence on the landowners; the bourgeoisie created a constitutional basis for the working people's struggle for their political and socio-economic rights and freedoms. It created parliament and introduced universal suffrage, local government and courts by jury.

But bourgeois democracy has always been inconsistent, imperfect, limited and internally contradictory owing in the last resort to the prevalence of capitalist production relations and the private ownership of the means of production. The economic power of the capitalists—a minority of the population—gives them political power, enabling them to consolidate and protect the system of exploitation. Therefore, a democratic state structure and a democratic political regime cannot be established when the capitalist state is anti-democratic! Democracy, which implies the rule of the majority over the minority, the equality of all citizens, their democratic rights and freedoms, proves to be a lie and hypocrisy in a bourgeois society. Although freedom and equality are formally proclaimed in this society, the working people are not economically free and equal. It is the rule *over* the majority instead of the rule *of* the majority, and only the ruling class can really enjoy democratic rights and freedoms. The institutions of bourgeois democracy (parliament, a multi-party system, etc.) are designed to carry out the will of the ruling class instead of protecting the society's interests.

The bourgeoisie is unable to implement its slogans of democracy, equality and freedom, since the establishment of genuine democracy would undermine capitalism. The future belongs not to the bourgeoisie, but to the working class, which is the real locomotive of progress in capitalist society and which knows that it is its historic mission to build socialism and establish a new, superior form of democracy.

The socialist production relations and the public ownership of the means of production are the substance of socialist democracy. After coming to power, the working class establishes the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the broadest and truest form of democracy for all the working people. Lenin said that the dictatorship of the proletariat radically differs from the dictatorship of other classes in that the "dictatorship of the landowners and bourgeoisie was the forcible suppression of the resistance offered by the vast majority of the population, namely, the working people", and that "in contrast, proletarian dictatorship is the forcible suppression of the resistance of the exploiters, i.e., an insignificant minority of the population, the landowners and capitalists".¹ It follows that the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat at the same time means "to the toiling classes, i.e., the vast majority of the population, greater practical opportunities for enjoying democratic rights and liberties than ever existed before, even approximately, in the best and most democratic bourgeois republics".²

Democracy means a form of state and a form of the organisation of society's political life. In both connotations socialist democracy is a new and higher stage of democracy.

The socialist state, which has supplanted the bourgeois state machinery, is a thoroughly democratic institution and an instrument of the working class that is fulfilling its historic mission of building a communist society. The new forms of the socialist state's activities are among the factors that reflect its new, democratic nature.

Today, the complex yet dynamic socialist society has many forms and institutions which embody popular rule; they fall into two main groups, depending on whether the people's will is realised directly or through the political superstructure, the state.

The representative bodies of people's power are the highest form of socialist democratic organisation. They combine the features of government and mass organisations, and the people take a direct part in their work. These organisations include the Soviets in the USSR,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 464.

² Ibid., p. 465.

the State Assembly and the local councils in Hungary, and the Sejm and the national councils in Poland. They are the basis of all state machinery and enable the people to play a big part in the state guidance of society and in state policy-making.

In the socialist states, the elective organs of the state differ from bourgeois parliaments and local government bodies in that they consist of elected true representatives of the people, combine legislative and executive functions and control all state bodies. The elective state bodies' powers are steadily increasing, and they are playing a larger part in the guidance of socialist development and are assuming greater responsibility for it. They do not hide anything from the people, but keep in constant touch with them and draw them into important decision-making. The people control these bodies, which are accountable to them. The electors may recall a deputy whenever he does not carry out their will.

In the socialist countries, the people always devote a great deal of attention to the elective state bodies' work. In the USSR, for example, the local Soviets have recently been vested with many new powers and given additional financial means; the people now have stricter control over the deputies' work. In 1969, they recalled over 300 deputies from local Soviets before their term had expired.

Activists play a big part in the elections to state bodies. In 1971, the election commissions which prepared elections to the Soviets included over nine million persons, 60.9 per cent of which were workers and collective farmers.¹ In Hungary, 400,000 activists took part in preparations for elections to the State Assembly and the councils. In socialist countries, every citizen who has the right to vote normally exercises that right. In the Soviet Union, 99.89 per cent of the electorate voted in the 1971 elections to the republican Supreme Soviets.² In the Mongolian People's Republic, 99.99 per cent of the electorate voted in the 1969 elections to the khurals of people's deputies.

The deputies in the socialist countries come from every walk of life, nationality and age group. In the Soviet Union, there are over two million deputies who, apart from fulfilling their official obligations, usually work at an enter-

¹ *Izvestia*, June 19, 1971.

² *Ibid.*

prise or organisation and participate in the execution of adopted decisions. This strengthens the elective bodies' ties with the people and enables them to meet the latter's requirements. The table below shows the composition of the higher representative bodies in European socialist countries.

Higher Representative Bodies' Social Composition¹

Country	Year	Deputies	of which		Intellectuals, office workers and others
			workers	peasants	
Bulgaria	1966	416	50	51	315
Hungary	1967	349	126	52	171
GDR	1967	500	216	71	213
Mongolia	1969	297	69	84	144
Poland	1969	460	79	70	311
Rumania	1969	465	92	76	297
Soviet Union . . .	1970	1,517	481	282	754
Yugoslavia	1969	620	4	1	615

Nation-wide and local referenda on political decisions are also institutions of direct democracy. Various mass organisations ascertain the people's will, which is another way in which the people take a direct part in state decision-making.

The socialist state encourages the activities of such mass organisations as trade unions, co-operatives, youth and women's organisations, and voluntary societies and associations (such as scientific, student, cultural, technical, civil defence and sporting organisations). They all take an active part in politics and exert a big influence on state decision-making. The trade unions and youth and co-operative organisations are the largest among them, as the following tables illustrate.

¹ This and other tables are taken from the "Political Structure of Socialist States" (Supplement to *World Marxist Review* No. 8, 1970). The information on the social composition of the People's Chamber of the GDR has been taken from the *Demokratie in der DDR* (Berlin, 1968, S. 53).

Many socialist countries have united popular or national fronts in which many sections of the population, political parties and mass organisations co-operate. Due to their important political functions (such as election of deputies to representative bodies and nation-wide discussions of domestic problems and foreign policy issues), the fronts play a big part in shaping state policy and in drawing people into state administration. Being a reliable support of the socialist state, they show that the state is democratic and that its interests are identical with those of the people.

In the socialist state, the people also have other ways of directly and effectively influencing state activities; these include nation-wide discussions of the most important bills. During the nation-wide discussion of the draft Fundamentals of Legislation on Marriage and the Family in the Soviet Union in 1968, over 7,000 proposals and comments were sent to the appropriate standing committees of the Supreme Soviet, and thousands upon thousands were sent to newspaper editorial offices. During the nation-wide discussion of the draft Fundamentals of the Land Legislation that same

Trade Union Membership

Trade unions in Bulgaria	2.2 million
Trade unions in Hungary	over 3 million
Trade Unions in the Federation of Democratic Republic of Vietnam	over 1.1 million
Confederation of Free German Trade Unions (GDR)	6.8 million
General Federation of Trade Unions of the Korean People's Democratic Republic	over 2 million
Confederation of Revolutionary Cuban Workers Central Council of Trade Unions in the Mongolian People's Republic	1.4 million
Central Council of Trade Unions in Poland	170,000
General Trade Union Confederation in Rumania	9.73 million
Trade unions in the Soviet Union	4.4 million
Revolutionary Trade Union Movement in Czechoslovakia	98 million ¹
Confederation of Trade Unions of Yugoslavia	5.2 million
	over 3 million

Membership of Youth Organisations

Dimitrov Communist Youth Union (Bulgaria)	1.4 million
Communist Youth Union of Hungary	over 800,000
Ho Chi Minh Union of Working Youth	over 2 million
Free German Youth (GDR)	over 2 million
Korean Working Youth's Socialist League	over 80,000
Young Socialist League (Poland)	1.2 million
Rural Youth League (Poland)	1 million
Union of Communist Youth (Rumania)	2.3 million
All-Union Leninist Young Communist League (Soviet Union)	28 million
Youth League of Yugoslavia	over 2.1 million

year, about 3,000 proposals and comments were sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet. In the GDR, 11 million persons took part in the discussion of the new draft Constitution, and 118 amendments were made in the draft as a result of their 12,500 proposals. In Rumania, the bill on labour discipline in state organisations was widely discussed on the trade unions' initiative, and about one and a half million workers, engineers, technicians and managers took part in ad hoc meetings. At such meetings (where 60,992 persons expressed their views), 11,928 remarks and proposals were made, some of which were incorporated into the final draft.¹

The management of public property by working people is a paramount form of democracy under socialism. They exercise their economic management rights through representative bodies and agencies of industrial democracy, such as production meetings and workers' councils at enterprises, congresses and conferences held within a given industry, collective-farm meetings and higher organs of collective-farm democracy. The trade unions play an especially important part in drawing working people into management of production.

The all-round extension of such forms of working people's democracy shows that Lenin was correct when he said that, under socialism, "for the first time in the history of civilised society, the *mass* of the population will rise to taking an

¹ *Pravda*, March 21, 1972.

¹ Supplement to *World Marxist Review* No. 8, 1970, pp. 14-15.

independent part, not only in voting and elections, but also in the everyday administration of the state".¹

Socialist democracy differs from bourgeois democracy in the way it interprets the individual's rights and freedoms. From being mere words in bourgeois constitutions they are given life by socialism, which produces civil rights and freedoms unknown to capitalism and spreads democracy to the social realms undreamed of before. They include all sectors of state guidance and administration: maintenance of public order, economic progress and legal procedure, etc. Such socio-economic rights as the right to work, the right to rest and leisure, the right to education and the right to maintenance in old age and in the event of disability are the greatest of socialist gains.

The extensive rights and freedoms of socialist society are given solid economic, social, political and legal guarantees because there is no exploitation of man by man or private ownership of the principal means of production. The right to work, proclaimed and exercised in socialist countries, is guaranteed by the growing economic potential, greater remuneration, educational and vocational development. The right to social security is guaranteed by higher pensions and the increased number of those entitled to a pension.

Apart from these guarantees socialist democracy establishes new rights unknown to capitalist society, the most important of which is the working people's right to take part in the management of state and public affairs.

Socialist democracy, therefore, enables the individual to develop freely and creatively. The democratic development of the individual is economically, politically and legally guaranteed by the freedom of each person in society and the absence of forces that try to limit the individual's freedom in society. Under capitalism, the state suppresses the freedom of the individual as such, but under socialism, it observes the slogan "everything for the sake of man, for the benefit of man". The socialist state is invariably controlled by the people, who regard it as a truly people's state. The individual is no longer politically alienated when the state is turned from a master of society into its servant.

The development of the socialist system extends and consolidates democratic rights and freedoms and improves

conditions for the full development of each person. The experience of world socialism shows, however, that a class approach has to be made to the question of people's rights and freedoms. There is no such thing as "absolute freedom" and "pure democracy". These slogans, advanced by Right opportunist ideologists, are designed to undermine socialist law and order and socialism's political and legal principles. The new constitutions of socialist countries provide that a citizen cannot exercise his rights and freedoms to the detriment of the socialist system and other citizens' rights and freedoms. Article 6 of the Constitution of the GDR, for example, prohibits the dissemination of militarist, revanchist and other reactionary propaganda and qualifies it as a crime, inasmuch as political rights and freedoms are provided in the working people's interests and cannot be used to their detriment.

Socialist society enables its members to perform their obligations, including the obligation to work honestly, observe state and social discipline and defend the homeland. The unity of rights and obligations characterises the individual's legal status under socialism, for socialist democracy cannot develop fruitfully without discipline, organisational efficiency and a keen sense of responsibility. Irresponsibility and lack of discipline harm socialist democracy and prevent it from developing. Immediately after the Soviet state was established, Lenin substantiated the need strictly to observe state and social discipline in socialist society. He drew attention to the fact that the new discipline had to be introduced by the working people themselves as they build socialism. The various educational activities carried on by the Party, the socialist state and mass organisations play a key part in establishing and consolidating this discipline.

Members of socialist society must have good, conscientious discipline and self-discipline. A person's social activities become of greater importance to the collective and to society as a whole. The working people's general, vocational and political training improves as a result of the revolution in science and technology, economic reform and the democratic development of state and social life.

Unlike bourgeois democracy, which formally proclaims the democratic principles of the social and state system, socialist democracy means the genuine rule of the people,

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 487-488.

the rule under the guidance of the working class and the Communist Party. It is both a means of organising state and social life during socialist construction and a continuous process of improving the forms and methods of social administration in political and economic life, and increasing the individual's rights and freedoms. This is due to new social patterns, greater economic potential, scientific and cultural development, and the working people's greater political activities.

If the forms of political and economic life ceased to develop and no longer correspond to the requirements of socialist construction, they would prevent the new features of the workers' power from developing and hinder the working people's broad and effective participation in the management of social affairs. Moreover, they would obstruct the society from attaining its goals, thus reducing the rate of economic and cultural development, bureaucratising state and social life, and producing a personality cult and other adverse phenomena.

The improvement of the political, state and economic organisation of society under socialism cannot be regarded as an autonomous process. The state machinery may be restructured, new forms of the working people's socio-political activities may be introduced, and all forms of popular rule changed only on the basis of previous social experience. Thoughtless plans, reorganisation for the sake of reorganisation, and voluntaristic extremes can result in political and state forms being divorced from reality, can interrupt the normal functioning of the machinery of power and reduce its social effectiveness. At such times, "innovation" delays the solution of the problems of socialist construction.

Socialist revolutions have shown the importance of forms of power in society. Lenin wrote: "If the creative enthusiasm of the revolutionary classes had not given rise to the Soviets, the proletarian revolution in Russia would have been a hopeless cause, for the proletariat could certainly not retain power with the old state apparatus, and it is impossible to create a new apparatus immediately."¹ The people's democratic system was established largely because the working people, headed by the Communists, began to set up agencies

for the guidance of their national liberation, democratic and anti-imperialist struggle (national committees in Czechoslovakia, national councils in Poland, and so on). These bodies formed the basis of the representative system when revolutionary power was established.

The machinery of public administration, set up after the revolution, met the requirements of the time when the foundations of a new socio-economic system—socialism—were being laid and consolidated and when such problems as industrialisation, collectivisation of agriculture, cultural revolution, the development of industry, agriculture, science and education, were being tackled. Many countries are overcoming the social backwardness inherited from capitalism, and are rapidly advancing towards socialism, because the forms of political and economic life have made it possible to realise the great advantages of genuine democracy and to develop the creative endeavour and political consciousness of broad sections of the people.

In form and content, workers' power was obviously a historically progressive and effective power. Its forms were not intended to last eternally, but applied only to local social conditions. The first Soviet constitution—the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR—made the point that it was drawn up only for the "transition period whose task was fully to suppress the bourgeoisie, put an end to human exploitation and establish socialism".¹ In addition to provisions proclaiming state ownership the basis of the national economy the constitutions drawn up in the People's Democracies during the transition from capitalism to socialism provided for the preservation of private ownership and private enterprise and mentioned the setting-up of a co-operative system in the countryside only as a possibility (Articles 10 and 11 of the 1947 Constitution of Bulgaria, Sections 157 and 158 of the 1948 Constitution of Czechoslovakia and Chapter II of the 1949 Constitution of the GDR).

The forms of political and economic life changed as socialist construction developed, giving rise to substantial amendment to legislation, including constitutional legislation. The 1952 Constitution of Poland consolidated the reorganisation of the local bodies (1950), the judicial reform

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 104.

¹ *History of the Soviet Constitution (Collection of Documents, 1917-1957)*, Moscow, 1957, p. 78 (in Russian).

(1950) and the changes in the socio-political and economic development of society. This Constitution replaced the so-called "Short Constitution" of 1947. The 1948 Constitution of Rumania operated only until 1952 when a new constitution was drawn up to reflect important socio-economic and political changes. The 1953 Constitutional Law on the principles of the social and political system of Yugoslavia and on the federal organs of power annulled many provisions of the 1946 Constitution. In 1949, important changes were made in the 1940 Constitution of the Mongolian People's Republic.

The development and improvement of the forms of political power, the entire machinery of administration in socialist society is of especial importance today, since the social transformations have become much more complicated as a result of big advances in the economic, cultural and ideological life. The people's cultural level has risen sharply, and the masses are taking a more active part in managing social affairs. The scientific and technological revolution is radically transforming production and influencing social life. Appropriate forms of political, state and economic organisation were found to accommodate the new trends in socialist development. Therefore, important changes were made in the machinery of power and socialist democracy on the initiative of the Communist and Workers' parties.

The measures taken, however, do not terminate the search for optimal forms of political, state and economic organisation of society. Socialist society must conduct this search at all stages of its development. The decisions of the 24th CPSU Congress said that efforts to build communism go hand in hand with socialist democracy's all-round development, the strengthening of the Soviet state and the improvement of the entire system of the society's political organisation.¹ The Programme of the Bulgarian Communist Party (1971) defined the tasks of building developed socialism and said that socialist social relations would be enriched both in content and form. It said further that public administration must be aimed above all at consistently developing socialist democracy and raising the scientific level of management. The documents of the Tenth Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party (1970), the 14th Congress of the

Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (1971), the Sixth Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party (1971) and the documents of other parties in the socialist countries also underscore the need to improve the entire political mechanism of society, including the state machinery.

Under socialism, the development of the forms of political power, of the state, political and economic organisation is based on the time-tested Marxist-Leninist theory and on the rich experience gained under people's power, under socialist democracy. Yet bourgeois ideologists and Right and "Left" opportunists cast doubt on the importance of the socio-political system established after the socialist revolution. They offer the working people models of bourgeois democracy, which the working people have renounced, and distort the essence and purpose of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The experience gained by world socialism shows that certain bourgeois-democratic institutions can be preserved and used to carry out radical social changes some time after the establishment of people's power. This is true of the political, state and legal forms which can be filled with a new, revolutionary content after they are purged of everything that limits or depreciates the established democratic provisions and directly or indirectly expresses bourgeois interests and aspirations. In the Polish People's Republic, many provisions of the 1921 Constitution were effective until 1952. In Rumania, the 1923 Constitution became truly effective when people's power was established. In Czechoslovakia, the 1920 Constitution was effective until 1948, and so on.

Because the revolutions in the mid-twentieth century took place at a later phase of capitalist development, the workers' states inherited a more ramified network of economic, financial and accounting bodies that could be, with some modification, transformed into bodies for planning and managing the socialist economy. The new state severed these bodies' ties with the bourgeoisie and used them in transforming society along socialist lines on the basis of Lenin's tenets. Apart from these bodies, the new state also inherited means of communication and transport. Similarly, socio-cultural institutions which had arisen under capitalism but which severed their relations with the bourgeoisie also found a place in the polity of People's Democracies.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 226.

The people's democratic state did away only with those legal and state institutions and political organisations which had a hostile class nature and which had suppressed the working people under capitalism. This applied to the army, the police force and other bourgeois coercive agencies. The people's democratic state smashed these institutions and created and strengthened its own armed forces, state security agencies and similar establishments which had close ties with the people and which protected their interests and furthered socialist construction. Reactionary political parties, alliances and other anti-popular associations were also disbanded because, with the passing of time, they increasingly conflicted with the requirements of socialist social development and prevented the working people from carrying on political activities, from being drawn into state decision-making. This was understandable, inasmuch as the outward forms of bourgeois democracy had expressed its exploitative and anti-popular nature and its aim of preserving and consolidating monopoly capital's dominating political and economic positions.

The need to replace the retained bourgeois-democratic forms with socialist democratic forms became apparent when people's power was consolidated and radical economic, political and cultural reforms were carried out. The process differed from country to country, and its rate depended on the specific conditions in which socialist transformations were carried on.

The traditions of bourgeois democracy also had some impact on the first socialist constitutions, which were similar in structure to the former legal systems and partially reproduced some of its forms (for instance, the 1948 Constitution of Czechoslovakia made no mention of the President's responsibility and the 1949 Constitution of the GDR preserved the Lands and the Land bodies of power). But the new socialist states all had the same forms and methods of superior democracy, i.e., proletarian democracy. These forms and methods, based on genuine democracy, could alone enable the working people to take more effective part in state affairs. The final establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, therefore, naturally gave rise to forms of power which corresponded to the new conditions and which for the first time met mankind's democratic ideals.

The Communist Party congresses held in socialist countries in recent years have emphasised the need further to develop

and consolidate socialist democracy and have outlined the principal ways in which this was to be done. At the Eighth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, the First Secretary of the SUPG Central Committee, Erich Honecker, said that the Party must improve the work of the people's representative bodies, give them a greater part to play and enhance the deputies' authority. He also mentioned the need to consolidate socialist legality, guarantee the people's rights and freedoms and intensify the struggle against red tape and bureaucracy. In Hungary today, the main task is to give local and central councils greater powers and improve their work. In his report at the Tenth Party Congress, the First Secretary of the CC, János Kádár, said: "We are convinced that we shall take an important step along the road to socialism and improve the people's well-being when the local councils examine most matters with greater independence and responsibility."

The development of socialist democracy has nothing in common with the "models" and "patterns" which the ideological and political leaders of contemporary opportunism are trying to foist on the working people, and with the Right-wing socialist practice of the reformist parties in the capitalist countries, the anti-socialist activities carried on by the Right forces in certain socialist countries and the nationalist, pseudo-revolutionary policy pursued by the "Leftist" dogmatists and sectarians.

Right-wing socialist parties have held power in capitalist states. The Labour Party in Britain and the Social-Democrats in Sweden, West Germany, Norway, Denmark and other countries proclaimed socialism as their programme aim on more than one occasion and have exalted their alleged achievements and the virtues of their "socialist governments". They have tried to present the Scandinavian countries, Sweden above all, as an example of "democratic socialism". The facts show, however, that social reformism, which echoes bourgeois ideology and policy, is theoretically insolvent and practically insignificant.

When the social-reformists have held power, they made no substantial changes for the working people who continued to be socially oppressed and exploited. This led to mass strikes and political demonstrations. The one-time leader of the French Socialist Party, Guy Mollet, has admitted that the Social Democrats could not change the economic system

in the countries where they assumed power, which they sometimes held for many years. He cited the Scandinavian countries as the most striking example. The social-reformists declared that the formal aspects and the limited nature of bourgeois democracy were the "values" of the Western world which did not have to be revised.

* * *

Historical experience shows that genuine democracy can exist only in socialist society and socialism cannot be built without democracy. Socialism entails the establishment of full democracy. Lenin said that socialism cannot be victorious and cannot lead mankind to communism "without implementing full democracy".¹ No other social system is as democratic by its social nature as genuine socialism.

Under socialism, where no private property exists, democracy has a reliable economic and social basis. But it is not established automatically, spontaneously, immediately and for good. The ultimate establishment of socialism and the full triumph of the socialist revolution are connected with the struggle for democracy, for educating the people and training them to run society. This struggle will be successful only with the guidance of the Communist Party, which is aware of its responsibility to the people for the construction of socialism and communism and which knows how to achieve this aim.

4. The Socialist State in the System of Socialist Democracy

As Lenin had foreseen, the state is the main form of democracy under socialism, including the stage of mature socialism. This is predetermined, on the one hand, by the fact that the state is an all-embracing political organisation, comprising all citizens without exception. There is no mass organisation of comparable scale in society (the others embrace various, more or less numerous, social groups and strata). On the other hand, political power and administration and management of public affairs are exercised primarily through the state. Unlike other public organisations, the state is endowed with special attributes of power for this

purpose: it employs both methods of persuasion and methods of coercion, issuing legal acts that are mandatory.

The socialist state is also rather special in that it is an economic as well as a political organisation. It is the state, acting on behalf of the working people, with their mandate and in their interests, that manages state property and guides the development of the national economy. The state disposes of a vast economic potential and controls the commanding heights in the economy, so that the people's government is able to effect planned regulation of economic relations even in those countries where a private sector still exists. Through the state the working people exercise their power in the sphere of production, marketing and distribution. This acquires even greater importance as the economic role of the state increases with the development of socialist society.

The socio-economic, political and ideological processes developing in socialist society necessitate further strengthening of the state, and its more efficient use as the basic instrument for creating and developing the new system. This is an objective law of socialism, to ignore which can only be detrimental to its progress. However, the strengthening of the state is not reducible simply to expanding, increasing the depth and scope of its functions and endowing state bodies with additional powers by developing the state apparatus and strengthening professional principles in its work. The chief means towards strengthening the socialist state—as the documents of the CPSU and the fraternal parties stress—is further development of its democratic basis.

This is indeed the sine qua non for fuller realisation of the creative potentialities of the socialist state and for increasing its social efficiency. The development of socialist democracy also guarantees that the organisation and development of the state will correspond to the requirements of the time and reflect the achievements of social thought and practice. It must be remembered that today new factors of social development have emerged and are assuming a growing importance, strongly affecting state construction. The social conditions in which the state operates are changing and the social processes regulated by it are becoming increasingly complex: its social base is growing wider and the political awareness and activity of the population is being heightened and there is more and more interaction between state and public organisations. There is also an improvement

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 74.

of the cadre composition of the state apparatus with the recruitment of highly qualified specialists. Lastly, there is development of the technical aspects of administration and management, with ever more extensive application of the fruits of modern science in the organisation and activities of the state (the introduction of computers for data collecting and processing, preparing various alternative decisions, and in economic management and public administration).

Not infrequently, ideologists of capitalism striving to justify the anti-democratic actions of imperialist ruling circles suggest that new social phenomena, and especially the development of the scientific and technological revolution, render democracy obsolete (and even harmful in present-day conditions!). Making an artificial contradiction between democracy and specialisation and professionalisation of management and administration, they propose that all the controls should be concentrated in the hands of the monopolists and the managers they appoint, thereby depriving the working people of the ability to influence state affairs under false pretences, namely, on the excuse that they are incompetent to deal with them. Echoes of such theories are to be heard in the statements of Right-wing opportunists today. Lenin's thesis that the strength of the socialist state lies in the awareness of the masses and their support for its undertakings, in broader and more effective mass participation in state work, has lost none of its validity today. Only on the basis of democracy can the complex technical and social problems presented by the development of science and technology be successfully solved. Only on a democratic basis is the state able to receive exhaustive information, make a clear, objective evaluation of a situation, reach the optimal appropriate decision and make sure it is properly implemented. Democracy helps ensure that state measures, in the preparation of which the working people play a most active part, become their own vital concern and receive their active support.

The new social conditions serve to strengthen and interlink more closely two major tendencies in the development of the socialist states. On the one hand, there is further democratisation of all aspects of state organisation and activity and wider participation by the working people in the business of running society, and an increase in public control and

supervision. On the other hand, there is the increased weight and importance of professional elements in government administration and the greater role of its technical aspects. Neither technocratic and bureaucratic distortions nor neglect of the scientific aspect, ignoring the opportunities offered by achievements in science and technology, are features of socialism. The key to the solution of the problem of improving state management and administration surely lies in combining democracy with professionalism.

The opportunists concentrate largely on the part the state plays under socialism when they attack socialist democracy, distort its principles and slander its achievements. Various conceptions and many reformist, revisionist, "Leftist"-dogmatic and nationalist recipes have recently been advanced to slander the Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist state and the experience gained by world socialism in the establishment and development of socialist states. The conceptions artificially complicate the question of the state in order to conceal their anti-socialist nature.

Right opportunists advance conceptions and slogans which are designed to undermine the socialist state and belittle the important part it plays in society. They call the socialist state "bureaucratic", "state-capitalistic", "totalitarian", "neo-Bonapartist", and so on, and distort the Marxist-Leninist teaching of the socialist state and slander state construction in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

V. Cvjetičanin, who writes for revisionist magazines, maintains that "classical bureaucracy is being transformed into technocratic structures in the Soviet Union today".¹

These conceptions must be dealt with at a greater length, because they have become widespread, being often advanced as something new to Marxism. According to them, the socialist state cannot be the main instrument of socialist construction and a factor for developing the new social relations. It merely solves certain problems that arise immediately after the revolution: to defend revolutionary gains, to eliminate exploiting classes, to expropriate capitalist property and to create conditions for developing socialist production relations. But by performing these functions it assumes features which cast doubt on its usefulness at the

¹ *Praxis*, 1970, br. 5-6, str. 978.

next stage of socialist construction, for it allegedly becomes the sole owner of the means of production, a "universal employer", the master of labour and society, and the usurper of democracy. The revisionists maintain that the state is tolerated as a "necessary evil" only at the first stage of socialist construction, i.e., the stage of "state" or "administrative" socialism. At the second stage of socialist construction, the "progressive" forces must immediately "de-statise" society, i.e., eliminate the socialist state system. The proponents of these conceptions hold that this must be done by developing self-administration, which is fully to replace the state forms of managing society.

To substantiate their views, they quote passages from works by the founders of Marxism-Leninism with no regard to the context. Indeed, in abstract, these authors really did say that the socialist state must wither away, that it must be replaced ultimately by self-administration, as shown above.

Marx and Lenin put forward the thesis that the socialist state—the workers' most important and effective instrument—is a "semi-state" which is withering away, but accentuated its creative role during socialist construction until the communist social system is established. The adversaries of the socialist state renounce this dialectical approach, and cite merely the first part of the formula. The conception of the "de-statisation of the socialist society" conflicts with the Marxist-Leninist teaching of the state of the period of transition from socialism to communism and with the rich experience gained by the socialist countries.

The socialist state exists after the first radical revolutionary transformations not because certain subjective forces in society do not want it to wither away and to enable its functions to pass on to self-administrative bodies. Socialist society, which is guided by the Communist Party, has no sections of the population whose interests conflict with the people's interests and whose activities run counter to the people's will. The socialist state exists and gains strength due to objective causes, i.e., a certain level of the productive forces and social relations; these forces and relations oblige the state to play an active part during socialist construction so as to develop the society. To demand that the socialist state should play a lesser part immediately after the socialist revolution means taking an anarchist viewpoint; anarchists,

at best, regarded the socialist state as an instrument for quickly destroying any state system.

Engels, who often cautioned against such deviations from Marxism, wrote: "All Socialists are agreed that the political state, and with it political authority, will disappear as a result of the coming social revolution, that is, that public functions will lose their political character and be transformed into the simple administrative functions of watching over the true interests of society. But the anti-authoritarians demand that the authoritarian political state be abolished at one stroke, even before the social conditions that gave birth to it have been destroyed."¹ Marx expressed the same idea in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, where he called on the authors of the programme to distinguish between a transitional state—the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat—and the "future state of communist society",² which emerges when the dictatorship of the proletariat carries out its first tasks in socialist reconstruction.

Lenin was guided by these tenets when he was working on a programme of socialist transformations. He maintained that "there still remains the need for a state, which, while safeguarding the common ownership of the means of production, would safeguard equality in labour and in the distribution of products"³ both when the exploiters are suppressed, and when socialism is being subsequently built, and that "the state will be able to wither away completely when society adopts the rule: 'From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs', i.e., when people have become so accustomed to observing the fundamental rules of social intercourse and when their labour has become so productive that they will voluntarily work *according to their ability*'"⁴. But the state must exist until this stage and until the problems of building a developed socialist society are solved. Lenin called this state the "republic of full socialism" (having in mind the second stage of socialism), which is "higher than the republic of Soviets", i.e., the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union acknowledged

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works* (in three volumes), Vol. 2, Moscow, 1969, pp. 378-379.

² Ibid., 1970, Vol. 3, p. 26.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 467.

⁴ Ibid., p. 469.

that radical changes have been made in society's economic basis and social structure. The CPSU advanced the scientifically based proposition that the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has grown over into a political organisation of the entire people, into the state of the whole people. According to the CPSU Programme, however, the socialist state must continue to exist for the time being and it must be given a greater part to play, for contemporary socialist society has not reached the stage when there is an abundance of material wealth and at which no distinctions exist between classes, between mental and physical labour. The Programme says that the Soviet state of the entire people must organise the building up of the material and technical basis of communism and the transformation of socialist relations into communist relations, must exercise control over the amount of work and the amount of consumption, promote the people's welfare, protect the rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens, socialist law and order and socialist property, instil in the people conscious discipline and the communist attitude to labour, guarantee the defence and security of the country, promote fraternal co-operation with the socialist countries, uphold world peace, and maintain normal relations with all countries.¹ The socialist state creates and develops the material and social prerequisites for its withering away by fulfilling these tasks. The more actively it performs its social functions, the sooner the basis is laid for the state system's transition to communist public self-administration.

The Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries have supported and developed the CPSU's conclusion that the socialist state must be preserved and consolidated. At the Tenth Party Congress, János Kádár said: "We are convinced that the state plays an important part during socialist construction. We reject the views that cast doubt on the socialist state's role, belittle its importance and essentially threaten the people's gains by undermining state power. Our domestic tasks, together with the present-day international situation, call for further efforts to consolidate the socialist state, increase its organisational role in the economy and culture, and develop and improve state and administrative activities."

¹ *The Road to Communism*, Moscow, pp. 547-548.

The concepts which deny the need for a state under socialism are untenable also because they are based on efforts to counterpose the socialist state to democracy. According to the Marxist theory of the state, they are dialectically interconnected with, and even equated to, each other. No wonder Marx and Engels said in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.¹

Reformists and opportunists have always misunderstood the democratic nature of the socialist state, including the dictatorship of the proletariat, which they dogmatically counterpose to democracy. Lenin refuted the views of Karl Kautsky, Otto Bauer, Emile Vandervelde and other reformists and showed that the socialist state is profoundly democratic by its nature and that it alone can ensure full democracy. He wrote: "As the dictatorship of the overwhelming majority, the new authority maintained itself and could maintain itself solely because it enjoyed the confidence of the vast masses, solely because it, in the freest, widest and most resolute manner, enlisted all the masses in the task of government.... It was an authority open to all, it carried out all its functions before the eyes of the masses, was accessible to the masses, sprang directly from the masses, and was a direct and immediate instrument of the popular masses, of their will."²

The socialist state, the people's instrument of socialist transformations, invariably tries to unleash popular initiative and activities, and to teach the people how to run society. Lenin drew on Soviet experience when he said that "in the matter of true, not paper, democracy, in the matter of enlisting the workers and peasants, we have done more than has been done or could be done by the best of the democratic republics in hundreds of years".³

The experience gained in socialist construction shows that the strengthening of the socialist state in no way runs counter to the growing democratisation of social life. Under socialism, the indissoluble connection and interconnection between democracy and the state shows that only real deep-going

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works* (in three volumes), Moscow, 1969. Vol. 1, p. 126.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 10, pp. 244-245.

³ Ibid., Vol. 29, p. 184.

democratisation can improve state organisation and raise the level of economic, cultural and political guidance. The socialist state's real strength and democratic nature is based on the development of the people's initiative and activities, the skilful combination of the citizens' collective and individual interests and the active participation of people in social administration.

The views which deny the need for a state in the socialist society are ideologically rooted in the syndicalist and corporatist socialist doctrines of "economic" democracy and "industrial" socialism. The good side of these doctrines is that they strongly criticise the capitalist state and the capitalist social system in general. The founder of the trend of "guild" socialism, G. H. Cole, said: "The omnicompetent state, with its omnicompetent parliament, is thus utterly unsuitable to any really democratic community, and must be destroyed or painlessly extinguished...."¹

The proponents of "industrial" socialism took an anti-Marxist, opportunist stand towards the system that was to replace the capitalist state. They held that there was no need to set up a working-class political organisation to carry out socialist transformations, and simply said that economic management should be put in the workers' hands and institutions of industrial democracy established. Some maintained that as a form of economic democracy socialism could start developing within capitalist society. They, therefore, denied any need to bring the workers' class struggle to an end, that is, to overthrow the exploiting state. G. H. Cole held that it was enough to put economic management in the producers' hands and to replace political democracy by "functional" democracy and the state would wither away and lose "its economic and civil functions to new bodies".² He openly disagreed with Lenin on the need to replace the capitalist state by a workers' state.

Other "industrial" socialists admitted that capitalist political machinery had to be replaced and called for the immediate establishment of "stateless" socialism. A prominent American theorist of industrialism and leader of the Socialist Workers' Party of America, Daniel De Leon, contended that an industrial government, which had no political functions and which guided only the economic life

¹ G. D. H. Cole, *Guild Socialism Re-Stated*, London, 1921, p. 32.
² Ibid., p. 123.

of society, had to be established "on the very next day" after the socialist revolution. He said that the workers' party had to be immediately disbanded and the Central Council of Industrial Unions had to take over the administration of society.

Such theories lack substance. The proponents of industrial democracy believed that socialism could be built and full democracy achieved by establishing proletarian economic power and the producers' self-administration. Industrial democracy and the workers' economic power can be established only after the socialist revolution. According to Marxism-Leninism, the proletariat can control other fields of social life only when its political power is established. This has been borne out by the experience gained in socialist construction by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The theorists of economic democracy put forward their own plans for organising social administration under "stateless" socialism. They developed Robert Owen's corporatist concepts in the new historical conditions, applied them to the entire social organisation and held that the future socialist society would be a totality of various unions organised according to branches of production. James Connolly's formulation is a typical example of these theories. He wrote in 1905: "Under a socialist form of society the administration of affairs will be in the hands of representatives of the various industries of the nation; ... the workers in the shops and factories will organise themselves into unions, each union comprising all the workers at a given industry.... Representatives elected from these various departments of industry will meet and form the industrial administration or national government of the country. In short, Social Democracy, as its name implies, is the application to industry, or to the social life of the nation, of the fundamental principles of democracy. Such application will necessarily have to begin in the workshop, and proceed logically and consecutively upward through all the grades of industrial organisation until it reaches the culminating point of national executive power and direction....

"Socialism will be administrated by a committee of experts elected from the industries and professions of the land...."¹

¹ Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The History of Trade Unionism*, 1666-1920, London, 1920, pp. 656-657.

G. H. Cole has dealt with this at greater length. He argued that the representatives of all types of production and public services had to unite into guilds, i.e., centralised trade unions which alone were to be vested with the right to manage production in their field. The self-administrative unit—the factory—was to become the centre of guild life; it was to become a “natural and fundamental unit of industrial democracy” and the “basis of the larger democracy of the guild”. The higher-standing bodies of guild administration—district and national—were to be based on the principle of factory representation. The leaders of factories and guilds were to be elected “from below”, i.e., “by those whom the leaders will have to lead”. The national industrial guilds were to combine into the Industrial Guilds Congress, the “final representative body of the guild system on its industrial side” that functions as a legislative assembly. Like industrial workers civil servants were also to combine into national guilds, such as an Education Guild and a Health Guild. National guilds—the Co-operative Council and the Council of Municipal Enterprises—were to be set up for the members of co-operative societies and for all consumers.

The town, district and regional guilds were to combine into town, district and regional communes in order to fulfil various common tasks. The National Commune, the “communal organisation of Guild Socialist Society”, was to crown this system. G. H. Cole held that the National Commune’s nature and structure had nothing in common with the state machinery and that its most important functions were to co-ordinate the national guilds’ activities, delineate their competence and discharge certain administrative functions.¹

When applied to the communist future, these complex, largely utopian schemes of social organisation might prove to be interesting projects for organising production and other social fields under a stateless communist social system. But these schemes, interesting though hardly real from the Marxist’s standpoint, were intended to show the feasibility of building “stateless” socialism, based only on the producers’ self-administration.

There is no need to get so far back in time to find other predecessors of the contemporary adversaries of the socialist

¹ See G. D. H. Cole, *Guild Socialism Re-Stated*, London, 1921, pp. 42-138.

state. We may refer to the Right-wing deviation in the Russian Communist Party in the 1920s, when the young proletarian state was trying to consolidate the revolutionary gains. At the time, a group of Right-wing opportunists, headed by Bukharin, argued in favour of the “immediate withering away” of the socialist state and its instant growth into public self-administration. They were supported by the Workers’ Opposition, whose leaders demanded that the trade unions, and not the Party and the state, should play the leading part in economic management. A slogan of the Workers’ Opposition said: “The All-Russia Congress of Producers, united in industrial trade unions which elect the central body to manage the republic’s economy, can alone organise economic management.”² The proposal made by other “Right-wingers”, members of the “democratic centralism group”, that the higher-standing bodies of economic management should be elected by the trade unions alone bordered on this same essentially anarcho-syndicalist and corporatist platform.

The Bolshevik Party, headed by Lenin, strongly denounced these opportunist demands. Their adoption would have been a step backwards in socialist transformation and would have threatened the gains already made. Time has shown that Lenin was correct when he said: “The proletariat needs state power, a centralised organisation of force, an organisation of coercion, both to crush the resistance of the exploiters and to lead the enormous mass of the population—the peasants, the petty bourgeoisie and semi-proletarians—in the work of organising a socialist economy.”²

Efforts by revisionists to prove they were the first to “discover” that the transition to socialism can be made by social reforms, without the workers having to win political power, seem strange against the background of the aforementioned conceptions of “stateless socialism”. Lucien Goldmann, a French “Marxist theorist”, essentially echoed the views of the proponents of “industrial socialism” and expounded the following propositions in his numerous works: the traditional Marxist scheme that the workers, who cannot win any important social and economic positions in capitalist society

¹ The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee, Seventh printing, Moscow, 1954, p. 530 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 404.

and can reach socialism only by a political revolution and by the establishment of a state which would precede all important reforms of the economic structure, has been greatly revised. He contended that state machinery did not have to be established any longer to score successes in production control and in self-administration; the road to socialism would probably be similar to that taken by the bourgeoisie in feudal society, i.e., it would be a gradual assumption of economic and social power (though there could often be intense confrontations), followed by a revolutionary (Britain and France) or reformist (Italy and Germany) assumption of political power.¹

A comparison between the ideas of the Workers' Opposition and the conceptions of "stateless socialism" shows that they are alike and succeed one another. They all take an anarcho-syndicalist attitude towards political power, and put no trust in the workers' and peasants' state.

The opponents of the socialist state denounce the principle of democratic centralism, which is a very important component of the Marxist-Leninist teaching of the state and democracy. Democratic centralism is a universal principle on which the structure and activities of the state, the Communist Party and mass organisations are based in socialist society. It implies an indissoluble dialectical unity between centralism and the broad independence of the people in the elaboration and adoption of decisions and in the methods of carrying out these decisions and settling matters within their competence. Lenin said that under democratic centralism the "unity of essentials, of fundamentals, of the substance, is not disturbed but ensured by variety in details, in specific local features, in methods of approach, in methods of exercising control...."²

The founders of Marxism-Leninism carefully elaborated the teaching of democratic centralism to counter the capitalist state's bureaucratic centralisation and the anarchist and revisionist concepts of "pure" democracy. These concepts deny workers' political power and authority, and do not call for the establishment of their state and the organisation of their Party. The history of scientific communism shows that the

¹ Lucien Goldmann, "Moć i humanizam", *Praxis*, 1970, br. 1-2, str. 39; see also Lucien Goldmann, *Marxisme et sciences humaines*, Paris, 1970, p. 298.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 413.

anarchist theories of "stateless" socialism are closely connected with the renunciation of the principle of democratic centralism.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism gave a clear-cut scientific definition of the concept of democratic centralism, but its contemporary opponents often maintain that the definition is "weak" and "vague". Lenin said that centralism should not be "constantly confused with tyranny and bureaucracy".¹ He often stressed that one should have a clear understanding of "how vastly different democratic centralism is from bureaucratic centralism, on the one hand, and from anarchism, on the other".² He also wrote that "stereotyped forms and uniformity imposed from above have nothing in common with democratic and socialist centralism".³ The aforementioned opponents hold that the principle of democratic centralism is "vague" so as to renounce it.

A radical revision has been made of the interrelations between the higher and lower state bodies and the relations between the centre and the localities. In breaking the dialectical unity of the principle of democratic centralism, its opponents recognise only the independence of local government bodies and their broad competence. This was the stand once taken by the "democratic centralists", who in essence supported anarchism in social administration. Lenin called their views a manifestation of Socialist-Revolutionism, the most deplorable Menshevism and a theoretical expression of private-property mentality.

The socialist state is centralised owing to such objective causes as the public ownership of the means and instruments of production, a uniform planned economic system, the working people's moral and political unity, and their common views, aims and major interests. These causes make centralisation under socialism patently democratic, which cannot be said of other socio-economic formations. Renunciation of democratic centralism, therefore, runs counter to the interests of socialist construction.

The opponents of democratic centralism occasionally maintain that "independent systems" (such as federations, republics, autonomous units and communities) cannot exist when

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 46.

² Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 207.

³ Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 413.

society is centralised. They hold that democratic centralism conflicts with the Marxist principle of building socialism from below and furthers the establishment of a centralised and bureaucratic system where all decisions are adopted at the top and are handed down for their implicit implementation.

Marxist theory and the experience gained by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, however, refute these old arguments. In exposing the anarchists in their attacks on democratic centralism, Lenin said: "The opponents of centralism continually put forward autonomy and federation as a means of struggle against the uncertainties of centralism. As a matter of fact, democratic centralism in no way excludes autonomy, on the contrary, it presupposes the necessity of it. As a matter of fact ... even federation is in no way in contradiction to democratic centralism.... As democratic centralism in no way excludes autonomy and federation, so, too, it in no way excludes, but on the contrary presupposes, the fullest freedom of various localities and even of various communes of the state in developing multifarious forms of state, social and economic life."¹

This principle holds true to this day. It was applied in practice during the construction of the world's first socialist state after the Great October Socialist Revolution. In his speech at the Fourth Session of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, Lenin emphasised the enormous importance of the local state bodies by saying: "Our revolution accomplished its task so quickly in a few months, a few weeks even, because we relied entirely on the forces in the localities, we gave them full scope for their activities, and we looked to the localities for the enthusiasm that made our revolution swift and invincible. I am aware that since then our localities have undergone many different perturbations, so to say. The problem of the relations between the localities and the centre has been one of no little difficulty, and I do not want to suggest that we have always found the ideal solution for it. Considering our general level of culture, it was useless dreaming of an ideal solution. But we may confidently say that we have solved it more sincerely, justly and durably than it has been solved in any other country."²

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 207-208.
² Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 394.

These ideas of Lenin's were fixed in the first Soviet Constitution: the 1918 Constitution of the RSFSR. Article 56 said that "within the limits of its jurisdiction, the Congress of the Soviets (regional, *gubernia*, *uyezd* and *volost*) is the supreme power in a given territory". The entire system of Soviets was built from below, that is, the lower congresses and the Soviets elected higher representative bodies. The All-Russia Congress of Soviets consisted of deputies of the *gubernia* (at times regional or *uyezd*) congresses of the Soviets.

The points enshrined in the subsequent Soviet constitutions were fully embodied in the CPSU Programme, which provided that the local Soviets would solve all local questions.¹ In recent years, legislative enactments have been passed in the Soviet Union, giving considerably greater jurisdiction to the local Soviets, which are sovereign state bodies in their territory.

The socialist countries do not renounce the principle of democratic centralism, notwithstanding the great independence of local government bodies. On the contrary, they believe that the local bodies will be truly independent and that they will be able fully to exercise their rights by applying and strictly observing this principle alone. The central bodies base themselves on the principle of democratic centralism and do not infringe upon the local bodies' competence by their guidance, which helps the state's grassroots organisations to show growing initiative.

Centralism in the socialist state means that the lower bodies must fulfil the decisions of the higher state bodies, that the higher bodies can annul enactments passed by the lower bodies when they contravene the law, and that the local bodies, and the higher and lower bodies in general, must carry on their activities on the basis of common fundamental principles. This centralism is special, not bureaucratic. As Lenin put it, it is "understood in a truly democratic sense", for it "presupposes the possibility, created for the first time in history, of a full and unhampered development not only of specific local features, but also of local inventiveness, local initiative, of diverse ways, methods and means of progress to the common goal".²

¹ *The Road to Communism*, pp. 549-550.
² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 208.

This shows that, first of all, relations must be established between the centre and the localities on the basis of democratic centralism and, secondly, that the principle cannot be opposed by demands for local democracy or communal self-administration.

What do the opponents of democratic centralism have in mind when they speak of the "communal system"? They deliberately distort Marx's description of the organisation of the Paris Commune in his *The Civil War in France*, and try to use his teaching and the experience gained by the Communards to substantiate their views that the commune must be independent of the higher state bodies. But they gloss over the fact that Marx regarded the communal system mainly as a means of achieving national unity on a new and voluntary basis.¹

The opponents of democratic centralism regard the commune as the main socio-political and territorial unit and as the basis of the country's economy. According to some authors, every commune is to be an economically independent and exclusive unit which organises production within itself and distributes profits—with the exception of payments to the centralised fund.

These formulations may appear attractive, but they conflict with the trends of building a highly developed socialist society. In effect, the concept of a politically and economically independent commune extols the territorial and economic split-up of society. This can prevent the productive forces from developing rapidly and can obstruct the centralised leadership in having their objective demands met. If implemented the concept of "decentralised socialism" would adversely affect the whole of society and its individual parts.

Another fact is that the concept of "decentralised socialism" does not eliminate the danger of bureaucratism. It can even be that bureaucratism and formalism will be enhanced in the "communal" machinery of administration, and that this machinery will be alienated from the people's real interests. Reality shows that bureaucratism should be countered not by renouncing centralised leadership, but by augmenting and consolidating the principles of socialist democracy in the organisation and work of the machinery of ad-

ministration, by consolidating its ties with the people, and by establishing their stricter control over its activities. Better administration on the basis of the latest achievements in technical organisation plays an important part in this respect.

The "Leftist" dogmatists and nationalists continue the semi-feudal traditions of deifying supreme rulers, obedience to authorities, the peasants' age-old customs and the low cultural level of broad sections of the population, when they try to preserve and perpetuate the people's political inactivity, bureaucratic administration, and subjectivism in the adoption and fulfilment of all social decisions. They renounce the principles of socialist democracy as a "bourgeois legacy" and "revisionist rubbish" without giving them the slightest thought.

The Maoists advance an unscientific concept of the Marxist-Leninist principle of democratic centralism to justify their domination. They oppose the democratic nature of this principle by their own schemes, which entail rigid centralism and unquestioning fulfilment of all instructions "from above", reflecting the strictly hierarchic relations in the Party and the state machinery according to one's position. They regard democracy as "centralised leadership" and as a means of ensuring the fulfilment of the centre's decisions.

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works* (in three volumes), Moscow, 1969, Vol. 2, p. 221.

THE STATE, DEMOCRACY AND THE ECONOMY UNDER SOCIALISM

1. The Economic Role of the Socialist State

Opportunist ideologists have recently been taking a keen interest in the socialist state's economic functions and the development of socialist democracy in the economy. Many concepts have been advanced to oppose Marxism-Leninism by a social-reformist, revisionist, dogmatic and adventurist understanding of both the socialist state's tasks and potentialities in regulating economic development and the correlation of state and social principles in economic management. Right and "Left" opportunists do all they can to slander socialist reality and falsify the objective facts which confirm the correctness of Marxism-Leninism.

Opportunist views on the socialist state's economic role are based on the assumption that the capitalist state can ensure economic development in the interests of all society and that there is no need for a proletarian revolution which would put an end to private ownership of the principal means of production. The Frankfurt Declaration of the Socialist International said that "socialist planning is compatible... with private property".

The reformist ideologists equate programming in capitalist countries with socialist economic planning. But they ignore the fact that capitalist programming is limited by the nature of bourgeois society, and that it cannot stop or sharply reduce the free play of the market factors and put an end to economic crises and upheavals. Balanced production at firms and individual capitalist and monopoly enterprises cannot be applied to the entire capitalist economy.

The measures taken by the capitalist state, which has stepped up its economic activities in the last decade, occasion-

ally have some effect. But the economic role of the capitalist state should be seen properly: the latter is only an auxiliary factor that cannot fundamentally change economic development governed by the laws of capitalist competition and anarchy. This state does not have an adequate material and financial basis to regulate its economy.

The working people shoulder the additional burden of the capitalist state's economic activities even during "calm" periods. The state fixes prices in the nationalised industries in a way that the monopolies pay less than the population (in Britain, for instance, the monopolies purchase coal from the state below the production cost). The anti-popular nature of capitalist economic policy becomes evident during economic or financial crises.

Today, the Right-wing socialist ideologists have even forgotten their own slogans: they once contended with Marxists-Leninists that the capitalist state can make a non-revolutionary, reformist transition to socialism by carrying out nationalisation. They are now trying to popularise capitalist programming and capitalist economic policy, which they hold are a means of achieving socialism. They started by opposing the socialist revolution with social reforms, but now they have renounced socialism and are defending state-monopoly capitalism.

Paradoxically, Right opportunists, who exalt the capitalist state's economic role, at the same time support a curtailment of the socialist state's economic functions. Such views are identical to those of the ideologists who are revising Marxism-Leninism from the standpoint of "democratic" or "stateless" socialism. They essentially seek to enervate the socialist state's role. The opportunist attacks on socialist polity are, therefore, linked with attacks on the socialist state's economic role. They are, as a rule, "theoretically" substantiated by the allegations that it is not characteristic of the socialist state to "intervene" in the economy, and that it must immediately stop its economic activities.

The ideologists of Right opportunism lay special emphasis on the renunciation of the principles of centralised planned economic management and make a revisionist interpretation of economic reform. This interpretation is based on the idea of disbanding all the leading central economic bodies, renouncing planned management, separating economic guidance from political decision-making, and gradually

eliminating public property. In essence, they want to prevent the socialist state from working out and pursuing an economic policy and to witness the free play of market forces with all its unfavourable consequences.

Those who oppose the socialist state's economic role often try to disguise themselves by assuring uninformed readers that they are following Marx's tenets or "creatively developing Marxism". Ota Šik occasionally tries to demonstrate his erudition by quoting from the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. It is, therefore, necessary to show how the founders of Marxism-Leninism raise the question of the correlation between the proletarian state and the economy so as to refute the arguments of those who hide behind Marxist phraseology.

According to Marxism, the economic basis of society ultimately gives rise to a state, which, in its turn necessarily influences economic development. Engels said that the state exerts this influence in three ways. State power "can run in the same direction, and then development is more rapid; it can oppose the line of economic development, in which case nowadays it will go to pieces in the long run in every great people; or it can prevent the economic development from proceeding along certain lines, and prescribe other lines. This case ultimately reduces itself to one of the two previous ones. But it is obvious that in cases two and three the political power can do great damage to the economic development and cause a great squandering of energy and material."¹

As we have seen, the state in capitalist society uses force to preserve the historically doomed capitalist production relations, i.e., relations of private ownership and human exploitation. Although it can give an impetus to economic development at individual stages, it is ultimately reactionary. The socialist state is a creative and progressive factor of economic and social development owing, among other things, to the fact that its task is to set up the socialist economic system and gradually transform socialist production relations into communist ones.

Marxism-Leninism attaches great importance to the economic role of the proletarian state. Marx and Engels were the first to advance and scientifically substantiate this role. The

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1956, pp. 503-504.

socialist revolutions have shown that the economic tasks of the future socialist state play the most important part among the numerous functions of the workers' state. Marx and Engels said: "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible."¹

The socialist state performs this production function due to the objective requirement of society's basis. The need for the state to exert an influence on the economy is felt even under capitalism, since the collective labour of an enormous number of people must be organised and regulated before production can be socialised. This influence, exercised in the ruling-class interests must necessarily be political and therefore becomes a state function.

The victorious socialist revolution transfers property to the people and gives rise to a single economy. This raises the socialisation of production to a qualitatively new level. Lenin wrote that under socialism the "transformation of the whole of the state economic mechanism into a single huge machine, into an economic organism ... will work in such a way as to enable hundreds of millions of people to be guided by a single plan."² He thus stressed that the socialist economy becomes a single whole and that the socialist state guides it.

Lenin developed and enriched Marx's and Engels' concept of the "national centralisation of the means of production" as the basis of the socialist system and stressed that, apart from solving purely political problems, the socialist state must deal with planned economic management, without which socialism could not exist. He wrote that "socialism is inconceivable ... without planned state organisation"³ and that "only large-scale, planned construction, which aims at evenly utilising economic and business values, deserves to be called socialist."⁴

Lenin drew attention to the objective basis of the socialist state's economic functions and their close interconnection

¹ Marx, Engels, *Selected Works* (in three volumes), Moscow, 1969, Vol. I, p. 126.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 90-91.

³ Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 334.

⁴ Ibid., Vol. 28, p. 36.

with the level and tasks of economic development. He gave examples of both a creative approach to economic policy under socialism and a search for more effective forms of planning and running the economy. His concepts now determine the activities of the Soviet state and other socialist countries in guiding economic processes.

Economic planning, the most characteristic feature of economic development in socialist countries, is dictated by the requirements of balanced, proportional development of social reproduction. It is a major economic function of the socialist state.

The experience gained by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries clearly shows that socialist economic planning is very effective. The Soviet Union has taken an important step in the establishment of the material and technical basis of communism and in the consolidation of the country's power and the improvement of the people's well-being by successfully fulfilling its Eighth Five-Year Plan (1966-1970). National income was to have increased by 38-41 per cent and industrial production by 47-50 per cent, but in fact they increased by 41 per cent and 50 per cent, respectively. In five years, the output of consumer goods increased by 49 per cent. During the same period, real income per head of population rose by 33 per cent, while the Plan had envisaged a rise of only 30 per cent.

Heavy industry, the basis of the economy, developed during the Eighth Five-Year Plan. The industries that determine technological progress—power, chemical, petrochemical, machine-building and particularly electronic and instrument-making industries—also developed at very rapid rates. Their share of output increased from 28 per cent to 33 per cent in total production. The light and food industries likewise developed rapidly. The output of agricultural produce increased on average by 21 per cent annually.¹

The 24th CPSU Congress approved the Directives for the Ninth Five-Year Plan (1971-1975), which is designed to raise the people's material and cultural level by rapidly developing socialist production and enhancing its efficiency, promoting scientific and technological progress and accelerating labour productivity. In five years, national income is to increase by 37-40 per cent (the consumption fund is to increase

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 41-43.

by 40 per cent and the accumulation fund by 37 per cent), and industrial production is to grow by 42-46 per cent. Agricultural output will grow, on average, by 20-22 per cent annually. Real income per head of population will increase by about 33 per cent.¹ These targets form the basis of the Soviet Law on the State Five-Year Plan for the Economic Development of the USSR for 1971-1975, passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet at its Session on November 26, 1971. At the same Session it passed the Law on the State Plan for the Economic Development of the USSR for 1972. The latter Plan envisaged for instance, an increase in national income by 6.2 per cent, the wage fund by 5.7 per cent and per capita real income by 5.2 per cent in comparison with 1971.² The minimum wage of factory and office workers, the salary of doctors, school and nursery teachers and scholarship grants were raised. The number of students entitled to such grants increased.

Other socialist states also face great economic tasks. The First Secretary of the CC SUPG, Erich Honecker, said in his speech at the Eighth SUPG Congress in June 1971 that the GDR's economic and political programme attaches paramount importance to the people's material and cultural well-being. By 1975, the real income of the population in the GDR will increase by 21-23 per cent; moreover, the population's income will rise, on average, by 4 per cent annually. From 1971 to 1975, the national income will grow by 30,000 million mark and will make up between 136,000 million mark and 138,000 million mark. Formerly, it took ten years for the national income to increase by so much (from 1955 to 1965, for instance). Industrial output will rise by about 34-36 per cent.

In Bulgaria, the national income will grow by 47-50 per cent between 1971 and 1975. In Poland, it will rise by 38-39 per cent over the same period, and in Hungary by 30-32 per cent. The Communist parties in the socialist countries believe that, at the present stage of socialist construction, state economic planning plays an especially important part in developing productive forces, improving the working people's well-being and encouraging the progress both of every country and of the entire socialist community. The

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 50.

² Pravda, November 27, 1971.

First Secretary of the CC HSWP, János Kádár, said at the Tenth Congress: "The major concern of our economic policy is planned socialist management, which is the only way to develop the productive forces systematically and which is the basis for building the socialist economic system. The Hungarian people built a new nation on the ruins of the old, industrialised it and created socialist agriculture after putting an end to age-old backwardness in merely 25 years after liberation owing only to the establishment of working-class political power, socialisation of the means of production and introduction of planned socialised management."

The Communist parties in the fraternal socialist countries have always put great store by improving planning. This question is now especially important owing to the extremely complex problems of socio-economic development. When a socialist country chooses ways to improve state economic planning, it relies on its own experience, on the enormous research that has been carried out, and on the joint experience gained by the world socialist system. In improving planning and management in Poland, emphasis is laid on the greater effectiveness of both central planning and economic management, and on greater independence and initiative of associations and enterprises in fulfilling their production targets. Importance is also attached to the development of long-term forecasting and programming and the elaboration of long-term plans. Comprehensive programmes for the solution of important social problems and programmes for the development of individual industries are to become part and parcel of planning in the country.

Besides producing compulsory short- and long-term economic plans, the socialist state effectively guides economic activities to realise these plans.

Under socialism, the state—the only political organisation to which all members of society belong—can develop the entire economy most effectively. It pursues a policy that helps to establish and co-ordinate various (including material) interests and requirements and that strengthens the worker-peasant alliance, the people's ideological and political unity. Its economic policy is designed to ensure the rapid development of all economic sectors, improve the people's well-being, level up the development of individual regions and districts, eliminate the gap in the living standards of individual groups, inherited from capitalism, and implement the

socialist principles of labour and distribution. The state has a specialised and internally co-ordinated ramified system for planning and running the economy, which makes wide use of economic and moral incentives and employs constraint when needed. It is able to increase labour productivity steadily, modernise production on the basis of science and technology, develop the most advanced industries and branches of agriculture and make the progressive scientific policy uniform throughout the country.

In managing the economy, the socialist state must guide an enormous number of working people and large production collectives, enlist their efforts for fulfilling planned targets, and co-ordinate and regulate their activities. The economy is run on the basis of Lenin's principles of socialist democracy, which envisage the people's growing participation in solving economic and political problems, particularly in improving forms of industrial democracy.

The socialist state must see to it that plans and decisions are fulfilled so as to increase economic efficiency and raise the responsibility of the administrative machinery, working collectives and all working people. Lenin said: "If we are speaking of a proletarian state, *that is*, of the proletarian dictatorship, then workers' control *can* become the country-wide, all-embracing, omnipresent, most precise and most conscientious *accounting* of the production and distribution of goods."¹ The state enlists the efforts of all working people in exercising this control. Otherwise, proper control cannot be established and the process of reproduction cannot be organised. Lenin emphasised the importance of control under socialism: "Accounting and control—that is *mainly* what is needed for the 'smooth working', for the proper functioning, of the *first phase* of communist society."²

Planning and forecasting of economic development, economic management, and accounting and control are part of the functions that the socialist state performs until it outgrows into an organisation of communist self-administration. Even communist society will have an agency to guide the people's economic activities, since the communist economy will be based on a planned regulation of social reproduction.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 105.

² Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 473.

The experience gained by the socialist countries shows that only the socialist state can assume the functions of planning and economic management. Politics cannot be separated from economics, for the one is the concentrated expression of the other. Under socialism, centralised planned economic management is inseparable from the socialist state. Demands to eliminate the state's economic functions are a deviation from Marxism and a trend of its revision from the standpoint of the Rightists.

The socialist states have to take account of their enormous economic potential. In 1970 alone, the Soviet Union doubled its industrial production by comparison with all the prewar Five-Year Plan periods taken together.¹ From 1966 to 1970, the GDR's national income grew by over 25 per cent; it now amounts to 108,000 million mark. The volume of production increases as economic ties become more involved. In turn, the revolution in science and technology introduces much that is new into both the techniques of production and the entire economy. The socialist integration of the CMEA countries demands that the socialist state play a greater part in the economy. The Report of the CC CPSU to the 24th CPSU Congress said: "The economic integration of the socialist countries is a new and complex process. It implies a new and broader approach to many economic questions, and the ability to find the most rational solutions, meeting the interests not only of the given country but of all the co-operating participants. It requires firm orientation on the latest scientific and technical achievements, and the most profitable and technically advanced lines of production."²

These tasks can be tackled only by the socialist state, whose foreign economic ties are based on a scientific prediction of the results of economic development and the coordination of plans for multilateral economic co-operation.

Opportunist ideologists maintain that there is no need for the socialist state to retain its economic functions. They often refer to the socialist changes, caused by the revolution in science and technology, and hold that the radical transformations in production, the growth in the role of science, and the changes in the economic structure and social life, can take place without organisation and guidance.

But the experience gained in socialist construction demon-

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 42.

² Ibid., p. 13.

strates that only with the help of the state can socialism surpass capitalism in scientific and technological development and in the use of scientific and technological achievements for the benefit of society. The Directives of the 24th CPSU Congress show the specific forms of the indirect effects that the revolution in science and technology has in the Soviet Union. These forms entail a uniform technological policy, systematic improvement of the economic structure, the development of basic research and the use of scientific and technological achievements in production. The socialist state must also take other measures to intensify social production and raise its effectiveness.

The Marxist-Leninist concept of the socialist state's economic role is incompatible with subjectivism, voluntarism and adventuristic calls for the skipping of necessary stages of socio-economic development. The "Leftist" opportunists, dogmatists and nationalists either ignore the socialist principles or revise them from an idealist standpoint when they advocate their economic policy based on the pseudo-Marxist proposition that "politics is more important than economics". They apply this proposition regardless of time and social conditions, and hold that political power can achieve the most fantastic results.

In China, the failure of the "big leap forward", the "people's communes" and the Maoists' other socio-economic adventures shows that the new social forms of economy inevitably impede the productive forces' development until the necessary material conditions are established. These forms can only disorganise production, and administrative measures can only aggravate the situation.

The Maoists hold that they are waging the same struggle as Lenin did against Economism. On the eve of the revolutionary movement, he denounced those who attached more importance to the working-class economic struggle than to its political struggle. The proponents of Economism, a trend in Russia in the late 19th century which hindered the development of the workers' revolutionary struggle, did not see that there was only one way of ending exploitation and emancipating the people socially and economically under capitalism when the means of production belong to the bourgeoisie: by a political struggle and the winning of political power. The Russian revolutionaries defeated the Economists ideologically under Lenin's guidance.

The situation considerably changed after the proletarian revolution. Lenin wrote: "The task of administering the state, which now confronts the Soviet government, has this special feature, that, probably for the first time in the modern history of civilised nations, it deals pre-eminently with economics rather than with politics. Usually the word 'administration' is associated chiefly, if not solely, with political activity. However, the very basis and essence of Soviet power, like that of the transition itself from capitalist to socialist society, lie in the fact that political tasks occupy a subordinate position to economic tasks."¹

Lenin, who headed the Soviet government immediately after the establishment of workers' power in Russia, cautioned against a scornful attitude towards economic problems and their arbitrary solution, and showed by his example that it was necessary to penetrate deep into the essence of economic life and make a scientific analysis of the existing situation and the development trends. He said that politics cannot be dissociated from economics, since politics expresses the vital economic interests of a class in a concentrated form, and that economic measures are carried out through politics. Politics is thus a means of achieving socio-economic aims.

Lenin attached importance to the organisational principle of regulating socio-economic processes, saying that "politics is a concentrated expression of economics", and that "politics must take precedence over economics".² Today, the revisionists vainly try to find contradictions in Lenin's conceptions and to oppose the proposition that economics plays the key part with regard to politics by the proposition that politics has primacy over economics. Lenin's first proposition refers to the Marxist idea that the political superstructure is dependent on the economic basis—the law which reveals the secrets of social development. His second proposition implies that there must be a political approach to all questions, including economic ones and stresses the importance of political power for safeguarding the basic economic interests of the ruling class.³

The 24th CPSU Congress developed Lenin's concepts that

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 71.

² Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 83.

³ See N. I. Azarov, *Lenin On Policy as a Social Phenomenon*, Moscow, 1971, pp. 76-87 (in Russian).

economics plays the key part in the socialist state's activities. The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev, said: "As Lenin had predicted, economics is the main policy for the Party and the Soviet state, a policy on whose success decisively depends the advance of Soviet society towards communism and the consolidation of the international positions of our socialist power."¹

The international aspects of the socialist state's economic activities must also be mentioned here. The Comprehensive Programme for the Further Extension and Improvement of Co-operation and the Development of Socialist Economic Integration by the CMEA Member-Countries, adopted in 1971, calls for the development of the socialist states' economic functions, which are performed on the basis of democratic centralism and economic planning. The CMEA countries are improving their economic, scientific and technical co-operation and their economic integration. This socialist international division of labour helps to bring their economies closer together and establish a modern multilateral economic structure. The process will develop on the basis of the principles of socialist internationalism and respect for state sovereignty. Socialist economic integration does not entail the establishment of supranational bodies, and does not cover domestic planning and the financial and self-supporting activities carried on by various organisations.

Each socialist state also plays an important part in establishing economic ties with the capitalist countries and in rendering economic, scientific and technical assistance to the newly independent countries. The socialist international division of labour takes account of the world division of labour and helps to further foreign trade and establish other economic ties. The socialist countries attach particular importance to the expansion of trade, and economic, scientific and technical co-operation with developing states. The Soviet Union has helped to build hundreds of industrial and agricultural enterprises in many Afro-Asian countries and has substantially increased its trade with them.

The Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist management are implemented in different socialist countries in forms that most fully conform to the economic, political and cultural conditions of each country. Lenin cautioned Communists

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 40.

against being conservative and blindly reproducing already known solutions. Socialism is being built in countries which differ in the scale and level of economic development, their economic structure and orientation, the traditions of management and the experience gained in it. During his visit to Yugoslavia, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Being Marxists, we know quite well that there are certain universal laws of socialist construction and universal fundamental features of socialism without which socialism cannot exist. The choice of forms of organising social life is the internal affair of every Communist Party and every people.... We are against the idea of opposing the practice of socialist construction in one country to that in another and especially against any imposing on others one's own specific methods of development."¹

Society faces new economic problems as it advances along the road of socialist and communist construction. These problems are not always identical, and they call for a specific approach and legal regulation. The Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries have, therefore, enriched the methods of working out the scientific principles of planned guidance and economic management. The fact that the socialist state performs its economic role through a variety of forms and methods in no way diminishes the general principles that determine the role.

The experience collectively gained in the revolutionary transformation of society shows that it is important to understand the socialist state's economic role, and that an uncompromising struggle must be waged against the distortions of the principles of socialist management, such as those made by Right and "Left" revisionists. Guided by the laws of socialist and communist construction, Marxists-Leninists are creatively applying these laws in the specific conditions of their countries and are defending and enriching the legacy of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This is indispensable if socialism is to be consolidated in every country and in the socialist community as a whole, and if the world communist and workers' movement is to develop.

¹ *Pravda*, September 24, 1971.

2. "Non-Intervention" of the State in the Economy and Ownership under Socialism

The "Left" opportunists resort to primitive demagogic slogans, such as the "politics is a guiding force", in their adventurist economic campaigns to undermine and debilitate the still unconsolidated socialist economic principles. Right opportunists hinder socialist economic development, deny the state's effective regulation of economic development and call for the "liberation" of the socialist economy from the state. This creates the impression that the Right and "Left" opportunists take a basically different stand. Essentially, however, they are one in their hostile attitude to Marxism-Leninism and the experience gained by world socialism. They actually want the socialist economy to degenerate and "free" it in the same way as it is "freed" in the capitalist world.

The conceptions that call for the renunciation by the socialist state of planned economic management, which is tantamount to the non-intervention of the state in the economy, are of particular interest. The demands for "free" economic development and the abolition of the socialist state's economic functions are the quintessence of modern "democratic socialism". They echo the views of the ideologists who advocate "stateless socialism".

As early as the mid-1950s, Milovan Djilas attacked both the socialist system and Marxism-Leninism, and slandered the socialist state and its economic activities. In his book *The New Class* he created the impression that socialist society was passing through a bourgeois degeneration. He held that the ideals of the socialist revolution had never been realised, and that a new "etatist" class had arisen under people's power that appropriated the fruits of the workers' labour and even exploited the workers.

Many of Djilas' views are still found in the conceptions of the contemporary revisionists who make pseudo-revolutionary calls for an immediate end to bureaucracy and technocracy and who demand that the state machinery should be disbanded and that the collectives of direct producers should act as administrators. In keeping with the Western philosophical trend, the opponents of state economic management hold that the "direct producer's alienation from the means of production must be overcome" and that the "lost"

values of democracy must be re-established. The Right revisionist ideologists contend that this can be brought about by a wand of magic—by putting an end to state planning and economic management.

The revisionists falsify the successes scored in socialist construction by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries so as to justify their conceptions. They spread the false notion that the Soviet state is no longer a people's state and that, in guiding the processes of social production, it has become the owner of the means of production and the workers' employer.

The views of Svetozar Stojanović are relevant in this respect. He writes that a new system of social relations, called "etatism", arose as a result of the evolution of the means of production which were socialised during the October Revolution and that, under this system, the state fully merged with the Party and other political organisations to become a joint owner of the means of production, in which capacity it now "employs" labour-power and "exploits" it. He maintains that in the distribution of surplus value the personal share of the members of the ruling class is commensurate with the position they hold in the state hierarchy.¹

Although contemporary revisionists try to say "something new" in Marxism, they basically repeat many theories of bourgeois economists, philosophers and jurists; many do not see the basic distinctions between socialism and capitalism.

Some bourgeois authors seek differences between socialism and capitalism in the field of exchange, and not in social relations. They hold that even nationalisation under capitalism may be called "socialism", and that socialism differs from capitalism in two major ways: (1) centralised planning and economic management, and (2) absence of a free market. This interpretation of both socialism and the differences between it and capitalism naturally has nothing in common with Marxist-Leninist theory and socialist reality.

The bourgeois theorists are wrong when they maintain that the market and commodity-money relations are purely capitalist categories: commodity-money relations existed before capitalism, and they exist in socialist society in a transformed form. Under socialism, they are developed and regulated in an entirely different way owing to the basic dif-

ferences between socialist and capitalist production relations.

Reformist and bourgeois ideologists interpret state ownership virtually in the same way. This is expressed in the identification of socialist and capitalist state property and in the failure to understand the essence of socialist co-operative property. They argue that there are no basic differences between state ownership under capitalism and under socialism. They regard state industries and enterprises in capitalist countries like Britain and France as being "socialised", usually contending that the state is a supraclass body which looks after the interests of all society. The "welfare state" is the most typical example in this respect.

They do not analyse the class nature of socialist and capitalist states, and they gloss over the facts that show the anti-popular nature of the capitalist state and the part it plays as handmaiden of the monopolies. At the same time, they falsify the class nature of the socialist state which, as we have seen, is the organisation of the working people led by the working class and which becomes the state of the entire people when a developed socialist society is built.

Another striking example of old revisionist methods of defending their doctrine is first to think up of characteristics which allegedly are inherent in a socialist country, and then to advance anti-Marxist views and concepts to "combat" these characteristics.

In the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist states, the means of production belong to all society, and they meet the interests of the working class and all working people. The socialist state, which commands the principal means of production, manages them on behalf of the people, who have authorised it to do so. The people themselves do not directly perform the functions of an owner, and, therefore, delegate them to their state, i.e., the state of all working people. But the state always disposes of the property of the entire people with the people's direct and indirect participation and under public control within the framework both of an individual enterprise and on a country-wide scale.

The revisionist critics of the socialist state's economic role make a fundamental mistake of a theoretical nature in alleging that ownership in the Soviet Union assumes the form of "state ownership", and that, therefore, relations of "employment", "exploitation", and so on, prevail in the relations between the state and the working class. They advance

¹ S. Stojanović, *Između ideaala i stvarnosti*, Beograd, 1969, str. 54.

this argument so as to confuse the connection between ownership and production relations. Marx refuted the long-prevalent view that forms of ownership determine production relations, and showed that the reverse is the truth, i.e., the nature of the prevailing production relations conditions the forms of ownership (ownership is the relation between people as determined by their attitude to the means of production).

In the Soviet Union, production relations involve the participation of the mass of working people in management and distribution of material wealth; their dominating features are friendship, socialist emulation, mutual assistance, collectivism, selflessness, conscientious discipline and a keen sense of responsibility. These genuinely socialist production relations were not the automatic result of the nationalisation of the means of production, but of the Communist Party's lengthy and consistent struggle for the establishment and development of these new production relations. In the socialist economy, the prevalence of socialist production relations enables the population to take part in running social reproduction and disposing of property, and it implies that this property becomes public property, i.e., the property of the entire people. We shall see that any distortion of socialist production relations inevitably turns socialist property either into group property ("market socialism") or into the ruling bureaucratic clique's property ("barrack-room communism").

The question of the specifics of socialist property is of paramount importance for understanding the socialist state's economic role. The founders of Marxism-Leninism made no distinction between the concepts of state and public ownership under socialism, inasmuch as the socialist state is an adequate vehicle of the entire society's interests. Engels said that the "*proletariat seizes political power and turns the means of production in the first instance into state property*".¹ This is the stand taken by the Communist parties in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries; they believe that under genuine popular rule the property of the entire people assumes the nature of state property.

This only correct understanding of socialist property makes it possible to combine optimally the broad initiative of the working people and the socialist state's creative, scien-

¹ Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 384.

tifically substantiated guiding role in developing the economic basis of socialism.

The conceptions of "barrack-room communism" and "market socialism" are the two extreme forms of revising the Marxist-Leninist concept of the nature of socialist property.

The conceptions that denounce all manifestation of democracy in political administration and economic management and call for the "etatisation" of the entire society are intended to prevent the workers from taking part in managing and to organise production on army lines. Under these conditions, the bureaucratic state machinery arbitrarily disposes of the principal means of production without taking the people's interests into account, and it prevents socialist production relations from being firmly established. In the economy, this leads to relations of authority and subordination and sheer administration. This prevents the workers from taking part in management and deciding how the values produced should be distributed, it is a disincentive to work, with work becoming universal labour conscription. Nationalised property thus does not become the property of the entire people, since property relations do not assume a socialist nature. Lenin foresaw such a situation and stressed that nationalisation is merely a step towards socialist socialisation. He said that "one may or may not be determined on the question of nationalisation or confiscation, but the whole point is that even the greatest possible 'determination' in the world is not enough to pass *from* nationalisation and confiscation *to* socialisation".¹ Even nationalisation carried out in the workers' state is still not genuine socialisation, for new, socialist production relations must be established, i.e., production must be managed by the working class.

But efforts to realise the ideas of "market socialism" in the economy and prevent the state from disposing of the entire people's socialist property are bound to divide up property, making it the property of individual groups. In this connection the arguments in favour of this negative attitude towards state economic regulation must now be shown.

Several theorists following the lead of bourgeois ideas advanced the conception of "pluralist property".

The conception of "pluralist property" was designed to

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 333.

limit and even eliminate socialist state property, bring to the fore the enterprise as a new and major form of property under the pretext of giving enterprises more powers and greater independence, markedly reduce the state's economic role and undermine its importance so that it would perform fewer functions of planning and managing production. The enterprises would become both the owners of the means of production and autonomous economic units which would carry on their activities only in their own interest and take no account of the interests of other enterprises nor those of the entire society.

The aforementioned conception was a logical continuation of the views of dissociating politics from economics.

The proponents of "pluralist property" do not call for a complete end to property, holding that it must continue to exist in the future as well. They maintain that state property must remain a form of property, but not the most important form; the property of self-managed enterprises is to play the most important part. This property is to include the property of the share-holding and corporate enterprises. The property system is also to include co-operative property and the property of non-state corporations and organisations.

The authors of "pluralist democracy" maintained that the enterprise had the simple aim of making as much profit as possible, and that the central bodies could not exercise any administrative rights over the enterprises, whose development was to be determined only by the free play of market forces.

According to the conceptions that attack the socialist state's economic role, the intensification and even preservation of centralised planning and economic management could restrain socialist social relations from developing consistently, since the bureaucratic machinery prevents the working people from managing social affairs and makes possible an unjust distribution of national income. In fact they confuse the struggle against bureaucracy with rational economic management. The Marxist-Leninist parties' unremitting struggle against bureaucracy is not the same as the struggle waged against state administration and its economic functions. Bureaucracy can be fought by developing the democratic principles of socialist state organisation, and not by artificially and untimely replacing this organisation by producers' self-administration.

Reduction of the state's role greatly obstructs centralised guidance. Society must be quickly re-equipped technically owing to the rapidly developing revolution in science and technology. The extremely difficult questions of economic forecasting have to be immediately settled, new lines of production have to be elaborated and the most perspective ones have to be selected as soon as possible. Only the socialist state can solve these problems which are vitally important to society. Individual enterprises or even groups of enterprises cannot solve such global problems without their activities being co-ordinated from a single centre.

Socialism is the only system that safeguards the people's economic interests. The socialist social system is superior to the capitalist system because it puts an end to capitalist anarchy in production, prevents the senseless waste of social labour, enables people to co-ordinate their action with that of objective laws so as to meet their interests more fully and rationally. Engels wrote that, as property becomes socialised, the working people skilfully apply the laws of their "own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of nature foreign to, and dominating him... Only from that time will man himself, with full consciousness, make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him."¹

Society uses the socialist state to achieve the declared aims, to ascertain and co-ordinate various requirements. The state represents people's overall and long-term interests. The denial of the state's economic role and especially the elimination of centralised principles in social reproduction, therefore, isolate individual interests and lead to a "free play" of relations and influences in which the integrating principle is eliminated and the public interest forgotten, and in which a struggle breaks out for the prevalence of group, parochial and narrow national interests.

The propagation of such conceptions means a departure from the Marxist-Leninist concept of the correlation between consciousness and spontaneity in social development. The Right revisionists try to belittle the importance of the Party's and the state's rational guidance and to prepare the ground for the spontaneous operation of economic laws even by de-

¹ Engels, *Anti-Dühring*, Moscow, 1969, p. 336.

parting from the specific economic laws of socialism (such as the law of balanced, planned development of production).

The Right revisionist ideologists now echo Bogdanov's and Bukharin's views that the state should "not intervene" in the economy, that the Party should not guide economic development, that the economy should be allowed to develop haphazardly. These views produced propositions about the admissibility of economic anarchy and emphasised the paramount importance of the free action of both the law of value (which is allegedly the best regulator of production and distribution) and of the market factors.

These non-Marxist conceptions are rooted in the ideology of the petty bourgeoisie which, as Lenin said, "oppose every kind of state intervention, accounting and control, whether it be state-capitalist or state-socialist. This is an unquestionable fact of reality whose misunderstanding lies at the root of many economic mistakes".¹

While calling for the abolition of the state function of economic management and planning, the adversaries of the socialist state are adopting the petty-bourgeois slogans of freedom of initiative and competition. Engels wrote that free competition "will suffer no limitation, no state supervision", that "the whole state is but a burden to it", and that "it would reach its highest perfection in a wholly ungoverned anarchic society".² This is how a transition is made from a denial of the state's economic role to various theories of "stateless" economic guidance, the most common of which is the conception of the "market economy", or "market socialism".

3. "Market Socialism": Theory and Practice

As we have seen, the state is the only body concerned with centralised planning and economic management in socialist society. But the conception of "de-etatised" economy negates the need for a single guiding and planning economic centre and splits the function of economic management by transferring it to a multitude of industries, amalgamations and individual enterprises. One of the well-known "market economy" proponents, Ota Šik, identified centralised

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 331.

² Marx, Engels, *On Britain*, Moscow, 1962, p. 314.

management with authoritarianism and declared "war" on the latter. He wrote: "We oppose the guided planning of the socialist countries. . . . In the economy, the matter in question was above all the elimination of highly centralised planning and authoritarian management. . . . It was clear to us that the market economy elements could not be combined with the old guided planning. A genuine market interest cannot exist so long as the plan providing for the decisions is imposed from above. In our reform, we, therefore, attached the greatest importance to the enterprises' independence. Every enterprise must work on its own strength, and the profit it makes must be crucial for its development. The administrative staff of an enterprise must be free from state bureaucracy."¹

Such arguments are mainly designed to distort the Marxist-Leninist concept of the correlation of the plan and the market under socialism and to show that centralised planned management is incompatible with the real market and the material incentives to work.

Marxism-Leninism has never denied that social reproduction has a commodity nature under socialism, based as it is on public ownership of the means of production. The socialist countries highlight centralised management and seek to use the economic levers most effectively so as to guide social reproduction. In his speech at the 24th CPSU Congress, Leonid Brezhnev said: "In its work to improve the guidance of the national economy, the Party has firmly followed the line of correctly combining directive assignments by central organs and the use of economic levers for exerting an influence on production. These levers—cost accounting, prices, profit, credit, forms of material incentives, and so on—are designed to create economic conditions promoting the successful activity of production collectives, millions of working people, and to ensure well-grounded evaluations of the results of their work. The need for precisely defining the measure of labour and the measure of consumption demands skilful use of all these levers, and improvement of commodity-money relations."²

Unlike capitalist commodity economy, socialist social reproduction cannot be regulated by the spontaneous laws of

¹ Ota Šik, *Priredni model demokratskog socijalizma*, Gledišta, Beograd, 1970, br. 8-9, str. 1162-1164.

² 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 83.

commodity production. The socialist state establishes and ensures the necessary proportions in social reproduction. It also prevents labour and material resources from being wasted and accelerates economic development. But it cannot do this without planning and forecasting economic development. Socialist commodity production thus radically differs from capitalist commodity production in that socialism makes it possible to plan economic and social development. The plan, which does not deny the law of value, is an advantage and a distinguishing feature of the socialist economy. Under socialism, the market acts as a means of fulfilling the plan, which of necessity restricts the sphere of action of the market system and prevents the spontaneous operation of the laws of commodity production. Ever since the Soviet state was established, the CPSU has sought to combine the plan and the market in an optimal way. The decisions of the 11th Party Conference in 1921 said: "At the given moment, the Russian Communist Party's main economic task is to guide the Soviet state's economic activities in a direction that will make it possible to control the market on the strength of its existence and its laws, and to regulate it and money circulation by taking systematic and well-considered economic measures based on a correct assessment of the market process."¹

According to Marxist-Leninist political economy, socialist commodity production has a mechanism which promotes the productive forces' development and raises labour productivity. This mechanism is employed as social reproduction is guided. The socialist enterprises must, therefore, be given a certain independence in production and other activities owing both to the use of this mechanism and to the need for the market and commodity production in general. Lenin said that under socialism "each large establishment should be given greater independence and initiative in the disposal of financial and material resources".² Commodity production and a certain degree of independence of each enterprise form the material basis for the people's creative initiative and enthusiasm.

The point at issue is, therefore, the extent of the enter-

¹ *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee*, Part I, p. 588 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 434.

prises' independence and the nature of the principles of the relations between enterprises and higher state bodies of economic management. According to Marxism-Leninism, the main principle is democratic centralism which is a combination of centralised planning and economic management, on the one hand, and the enterprises' independence and initiative, on the other; it is a combination of undivided authority in effective guidance and the working people's broad participation in vital decision-making at enterprises and in society as a whole.

The ideologists of "market socialism" oppose this view, holding that planning principles cannot be combined with an enterprise's independence and that the production units must be fully independent of higher state bodies. Ota Šik wrote: "Our main aim was to make the enterprises independent of the state."¹ True, according to Šik, Czechoslovakia should have had a kind of a "central economic council" which, instead of managing the economy and planning economic development, would have "established the aims of macro-economic development", studied the possibility of providing unemployed workers with jobs, and so on. He regards the economic plan as long-term forecasting and the basis for orientating individual enterprises in their plans, and holds that it does not have to be fulfilled; on the contrary, the plan must be tuned up to economic processes and applied in conformity with changes in the socio-economic field.

The theory of "market socialism" is aimed mainly at eliminating the state function of planning. Ota Šik maintains that, as a regulator of social reproduction, the state must be replaced by a "real" market which exists "within the boundaries where the state exerts influence by intervening in incomes policy, tax policy, credit policy, tariff policy, monetary policy, and so on".² This theory, elaborated by bourgeois researchers and reproduced with some modifications by Ota Šik and other theorists, also calls for:

the vesting of the enterprises or their amalgamations with all the main functions of economic management, full independence of the enterprises and their autonomy in respect of the state, decentralisation of the accumulation fund, an

¹ Ota Šik, op. cit., str. 1170.

² Ibid., str. 1165-1166.

enterprise's independent use of the means it has accumulated, and its independent distribution of income;

the spontaneous market regulation of economic processes, free competition, a competitive market struggle between enterprises, market competition of the commodities, capital and labour, the free operation of the law of value as the main regulator of social reproduction;

the indirect state's influence on the economy, through the policy of credit and interest, taxation, tariff policy, the function of money issue, and so on.

These views are shared by several other theorists advocating "market socialism". They call for the unrestrained decentralisation of economic management and the transfer of appropriate functions from the central state bodies to the enterprises and local government bodies. According to such theorists, enterprises must ultimately become the "main vehicles of extended reproduction and the managers of the surplus product".

But the differences in the said conceptions of economic development are insignificant. They are two sides of the same coin, and mean a departure from the Marxist-Leninist principle of democratic centralism in managing social reproduction. The workers' state must combat the trends towards anarchism and disunity and gradually eliminate them. Lenin said that the "building of communism undoubtedly requires the greatest possible and most strict centralisation of labour on a nation-wide scale, and this presumes overcoming the scattering and disunity of workers, by trades and locally, which was one of the sources of capital's strength and labour's weakness".¹

Lenin naturally meant democratic, and not bureaucratic centralism when he spoke of the centralisation of labour and production. He often stressed that the forms of democratic centralism can have their own distinguishing features in socialist countries, depending on the prevailing conditions, traditions and specific stage of development. Democratic centralism is the antithesis of bureaucracy, anarchism and the unrestrained decentralisation of the management of the economy and the entire society.

The management of the economy as a single whole on the basis of democratic centralism is an objective necessity and

a law of the socialist mode of production. The enormous economic achievements attained by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and the rapid, balanced development of their material basis demonstrate that the economic mechanism in these countries corresponds to the society's socio-economic structure and to the prevailing relations of production. But the absence of centralised planned management, which makes it possible to develop the economy on the basis of common interests, is bound to give rise to disproportions in social reproduction. That means, in particular, a dissipation of resources in the sphere of capital investment and the development of science, culture and public health. This engenders and intensifies social contrasts, creates and aggravates differences between the developed and backward areas, and inevitably leads to sharp fluctuations in the level of production, employment and the working people's income. The revolution in science and technology shows clearly the shortcomings of the conception of a decentralised economy.

Under the conditions of the market economy, the question of the fate of public (state) property naturally arises. We shall deal with ownership as such in greater detail, insofar as the opponents of the socialist state's economic role have long concentrated on it. Opportunist ideologists have often discussed the essence of ownership under socialism with a view to belittling the role played by the socialist state in the management of the property of the entire people.

The "most socialist" formulations are used to screen the usual anarcho-syndicalist aspiration to deprive the state of the function of managing property and to make individual groups of producers the owners. The vesting of individual economic organisations with the exclusive right to dispose of social wealth, given to them for production purposes, would mean virtually the division of wealth between them as owners; it means that every economic organisation can independently solve any question concerning the principal means of production under its charge. It can lease them, combine them with those of other enterprises or even sell them and use the money it receives from the sale of these means or produce to purchase other means, or spend them on other needs. This is precisely what any property owner can do.

Although enterprises are viewed by these theorists as public property, their produce is regarded as the property

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 114.

of the self-administrative collectives, thus justifying every collective's right to directly distribute an enterprise's income. The principle in conformity with which the state establishes a worker's wages can be allegedly applied only forcibly and temporarily, for it bears the imprint of "hired labour relations". When the fruits of labour are distributed independently, the remnants of these relations are said to disappear and labour becomes truly "emancipated".

The conception of the "independent distribution of income" is based on the spurious claim that the capitalist and the socialist state play basically similar roles in production. The relations between the socialist state and the workers are treated as "hired labour relations" so as to distort socialist reality. The socialist state is essentially an organisation of all working people guided by the working class with the Communist Party at its head. The relations between the workers and a state enterprise have the external form of "hired labour relations", but this is only for the purposes of accounting, control and the socialist principle of distribution. Lenin wrote: "All citizens are transformed into hired employees of the state.... All citizens become employees and workers of a single country-wide state 'syndicate'."¹

The socialist state's planned management of social reproduction does not contradict socialist property relations. On the contrary, it is a natural expression of those relations and it helps to develop and transform them into communist social relations. To deny the state this function, to introduce elements of haphazard economic development and to vest enterprises with the exclusive right to dispose of social property and the fruits of labour is not simply a deviation from socialist methods of management, but an attempt to change the nature of property and the essence of socialist production relations. "Market socialism", as outlined by its proponents, cannot be a special form of economic management, for it mainly replaces public (state) property by collective and group property and socialist production relations by the relations of both market competition and the struggle waged by various social groups and territorial and production collectives for the distribution and re-distribution of the national income.

Until recently, the advocates of "market socialism" care-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 473.

fully covered up the nature of property in the economic development model they created. They offered formulas of "public" property, which was supposed to be everyone's and at the same time "no one's" property. These vague arguments that claimed to show a dialectical approach were advanced to ignore the fact that in the market economy the enterprises (their collectives, in fact) might have become groups of owners and that public property might have become the property of individual groups.

Marxism-Leninism rejects the conceptions of "group", "collective", "divided" and other property. Lenin said that "any direct or indirect legalisation of the rights of ownership of the workers of any given factory or any given trade on their particular production, or of their right to weaken or impede the orders of the state authority, is a flagrant distortion of the basic principles of Soviet power and a complete rejection of socialism".¹ According to Marxism-Leninism, the principle of the unity of socialist property, managed from a single centre, is one of the most important principles of socialist society. Lenin warned that Bukharin's proposals on the distribution of property among enterprises was harmful to the socialist cause: "The task, the aim of socialism, as we see it, is to convert the land and the industrial enterprises into the property of the Soviet Republic.... The chief condition with us is discipline and the organised transfer of all property to the people, the transfer of all sources of wealth to the Soviet Republic, and their strictly disciplined disposal. So when we are told that the river transport workers will be private managing proprietors, we obviously cannot agree to it. Soviet power is to do the managing."²

The transfer of the principal means of production to enterprises as part of the "market economy" threatens to transform the purpose of social reproduction. Surplus value and profit can become the only direct aim of the enterprises, which fall victim to the free play of market forces. This state of affairs must not exist in socialist society, where material and cultural wealth is produced so as more fully to satisfy the growing material and cultural requirements of the people. It would be a deviation from Marxism and socialism to replace, even "temporarily" and with best in-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, pp. 100-101.

² Ibid., pp. 63-64.

tentions, this fundamental law of socialism by the law of value, borrowed from the historically doomed socio-economic formation.

The theory of "market socialism" essentially takes no account of such a specific economic law of socialism as the law of distribution according to the work done, i.e., distribution in conformity with the quantity and quality of labour expended. This law shows the advantages which the socialist method of management has over the capitalist, since it rules out unearned income. Control over the measure of labour and consumption, therefore, plays an important part in the socialist state's activities. The weakening of this control and the working collectives' "independent" distribution of income could place individual enterprises and industries in an unequal position and make for an unequal distribution of incomes among working people. Those working in individual industries with more favourable conditions would receive pay far higher than the average. Income from rent and other unearned income would be widespread and the monopoly position on the market would tend to be used to derive unearned income.

Once individual enterprises are given an absolute right to dispose of their income, they can include in their income not only the fruits of their own labour, but, to a large extent, "profit" from "their own capital", i.e., the enterprises can assume some features of capitalist exploiters.

The enterprises' free disposal of their income and means of production, coupled with market competition, would make individual economic enterprises operate in isolation from one another and from the entire society. This runs counter to the scientific and technological revolution, which requires concentration of the means of production and centralisation of material wealth in major industrial amalgamations.

Theoretically, the economy is disunited when it is relatively underdeveloped and when the economic system can still function without big industrial complexes. This disunity may retard social development if no measures are taken in a centralised way to overcome it.

The supporters of "market socialism" call for the integration of economic organisations so as to avoid the unfavourable consequences of "market socialism". The state takes no part in this process, which is depicted as a free and independent integration of enterprises on a "purely"

economic basis. But in a "market economy", integration would hardly solve the problems of economic management, since there are no guarantees that major industrial amalgamations outside state control would not carry on activities harmful to society's interests.

The aforementioned facts show that the forms of socialist economic management are interdependent and interconnected with society's economic basis, i.e., the production relations prevalent in it. Although the forms and methods of management ultimately depend on society's socio-economic structure, they strongly influence it and can even deform it when they conflict with the Marxist-Leninist principles of socialist management. Instead of systematic state management, the free play of market forces could introduce in production relations factors that are alien to socialism. In place of public interests the proponents of "market economy" give prominence to the narrow interests of individual territorial and production collectives. They try to replace the relations of friendship and mutual assistance by seclusion and self-interest, and socialist emulation, which plays a big part in the development of production and in the moulding of a new man, by competition between production collectives.

The market management model is criticised not with a view to imposing certain tested forms and systems. In conformity with its specific conditions, every country must creatively apply the principles of scientific socialism in the management of social reproduction. It can develop its specific functional apparatus and forms of planning and management, and regulate the correlation between the plan and the market and between centralism and decentralisation. But one must not ignore the deviations from the principles of scientific socialism, especially when these principles are supplanted by the anarcho-syndicalist and petty-bourgeois patterns of management and when centralised state management of social reproduction is superseded by uncontrolled market competition, which is alien to and incompatible with the socialist system of production relations.

The deformation processes in the system of production relations would hardly be confined to the economic sphere alone. They would inevitably influence all the aspects of social activities, the system of social relations, owing to the operation of the objective laws governing the relation between the basis and the superstructure. When surplus value

is declared to be the only purpose of production and wages to be the supreme goal of human labour, this will mean the projection of such aims and values which are a far cry from the socialist ideal. Those advocating the free play of the market forces forget about the most important tasks facing the socialist society, i.e., the formation of a harmoniously developed personality, the development of culture, and safeguarding of the basic human rights. They sacrifice one of the most important principles of socialism, i.e., the right to work (in conformity with which the socialist society must provide all citizens with jobs), to the task of increasing material production at any price.

"Market socialism" cannot ensure a steady development of society and make people feel certain of the future. The market anarchy would engender periodic upheavals in the economy and social life; it would create a situation in which people would feel uncertain of the future, and would give rise to a sceptic attitude towards political measures.

4. Working People's Participation in Management

The Marxists-Leninists' struggle against the Right and "Left" opportunists has recently centered on the working people's participation in management under socialism. Right-wing socialist leaders ardently "support" economic democracy and favour capitalist forms of worker participation in decision-making. These are designed to confuse and deceive the working people, to prevent inevitable social conflicts and to enable the monopolies to make profit.

The question of democracy at the enterprise is important to socialist theory and practice, as is evident, for instance, from the decisions adopted at the 24th CPSU Congress and at recent congresses held by Communist and Workers' parties in other socialist countries.

In the socialist countries, the objective need to consolidate and improve centralised management of production is coupled with a search for ways and means of improving the democratic forms of economic management. Marxism-Leninism has never confined itself to demands for full democracy in politics alone, but tried to apply democratic principles to all aspects of social life. Lenin said that "in actual life democracy will never be 'taken separately'; it will be 'taken

together' with other things, it will exert its influence on economic life as well, will stimulate *its* transformation; and in its turn it will be influenced by economic development, and so on. This is the dialectics of living history."¹

To apply democracy to production sphere means establishing production relations at enterprises and throughout economic management, at the root of which lies the workers' participation in the state bodies' major decision-making and their active and creative approach to the fulfilment of decisions.

The socialist state performs its activities in the working people's interests by managing the economy in a planned and centralised manner. This is what makes economic management social; the working people influence economic management indirectly—through the state and its agencies—and directly at enterprises in a variety of ways. They have every reason to regard themselves and the labour collectives to which they belong as the participants of production management at factories, in economic sectors and the country as a whole. State economic management guarantees the working people's *de facto* participation in management.

When the workers' participation in socialist economic management is correctly understood, one sees that industrial democracy at enterprises cannot be opposed to state guidance, the part played by state economic bodies cannot be underestimated, production cannot be "etatised" and workers cannot be prevented from taking part in running an enterprise. Social and economic problems will be solved most effectively, and socialist democracy as a whole will be developed only by scientifically combining state guidance and popular participation in management.

Individual economic units would become isolated when the personnel of enterprises alone performed the function of economic management. This is incompatible with the present trends towards integration. When enterprises are isolated, it is difficult to overcome spontaneity and parochialism. The formal "self-administration" of decentralised economic units could not become a solid guarantee against bureaucratisation and "technocratisation" of relations within production collectives and could not enable the direct producers to take part in management. "Decentralised" bureaucracy could arise

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 452-453.

in the economy, nullifying the workers' formally proclaimed rights to self-administration; it would be difficult to defend these rights when the state has no authority.

Those who actually fight against the working-class power sometimes demagogically advance the slogan of "worker self-administration". In 1956, this happened during the counter-revolutionary revolt in Hungary, when the anti-socialist forces tried to establish "workers' councils" at enterprises. The "councils" were designed to deceive the workers and win them over to the counter-revolutionaries' side. The counter-revolutionaries tried to draw many of their placemen (including the former owners of enterprises and their henchmen) into the "councils", which were set up outside the system of economic management to counterbalance the state bodies. The Right forces intended to set up territorial bodies and a nation-wide system of "workers' councils" to act as a "second centre".

The reactionaries in Hungary tried to revive Trotsky's scheme of the "proletarian state" and to use it to remove the workers' party from power and oppose the "workers' councils" to the bodies of people's power. The national "workers' council" and the trade union centre were to set up a "council of workers' unity", which would have had parliamentary control over the government's activities, including any change in its composition.

The working people abandoned the "workers' councils", when the anti-popular plans of their sponsors were exposed. The "workers' councils", as contrived by reaction, later ceased to exist, since they were incompatible with the people's rule in Hungary.

The Right opportunists tried to play on the idea of "workers' councils" during the events of 1968 in Czechoslovakia; they demagogically called for the establishment of working people's councils at enterprises in an effort to consolidate their stand among the working class, most of whom remained loyal to socialist principles. Ota Šik put forward this idea without the Party and state bodies' consent when he was vice-chairman of the Czechoslovak Government. The purpose of the councils was to destroy the existing system of economic management, put an end to socialist economic planning, and oppose Party organisations and trade unions.

Such demagogic slogans as "producers' control over production" were ultimately designed to carry out a political

coup. The "democratisation of production" undermined planned management and production discipline. The councils, which were influenced by the Right-wing anti-socialist forces, did not try to tackle specific production problems, improve labour discipline or enable the workers, engineers and technicians to be more active. Instead, they engaged in social demagogy and undertook political actions to undermine socialism in the country. This caused inflation and threatened the country with economic dislocation.

The Marxist-Leninist principles of popular participation in management were re-established when the Czechoslovak working people defeated the revisionists, opportunists and counter-revolutionaries in an acute ideological and political battle. The proponents of "direct self-administrative democracy" took the same road as the anarcho-syndicalists in Russia in the first years of Soviet power by trying to deprive the state of its role in social reproduction and give the personnel at enterprises the right to manage the economy. Immediately after the October Socialist Revolution the workers took over industrial enterprises at the call of Lenin and the Party. The establishment of workers' control over production and distribution was an important revolutionary gain at a time when uniform state power and centralised economic management were absent. When the socialist state's economic machinery was set up, the higher-standing state bodies and the representatives of state at enterprises assumed many functions performed by the workers' control bodies. Scattered enterprises thus formed a single economic system—the socialist economy—based on the public ownership of the means of production. The state had to manage the economy because, among other things, the workers could not effectively and independently solve the most difficult problems of managing social reproduction without appropriate state machinery. But this was not understood by the "democratic centralists", Bukharin's followers and other anarcho-syndicalists, who strongly opposed economic centralisation and called for full "industrial democracy".

Lenin who had never opposed democracy in economic management emphasised: "It is much easier to organise this in the political field than in the economic field; but for the success of socialism, it is the economic field that matters."¹

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 260.

He called for greater "participation of the working people in economic administration and in building a new economy",¹ and said that it was necessary to "enlist an even greater number of workers and labouring peasants in the work of administering industry and the national economy generally".²

Bukharin's slogan of "industrial democracy" was inapplicable because it denied completely the importance of the economic role played by the state and the Party and called for the replacement of political by economic democracy and for the establishment of self-administration bodies as a means to put an end to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin wrote that Communists were aspiring to guide non-Party workers and teach them to run the economy. He said that "syndicalism hands over to the mass of non-Party workers, who are compartmentalised in the industries, the management of their industries ('the chief administrations and central boards'), thereby making the Party superfluous, and failing to carry on a sustained campaign either in training the masses, or in *actually* concentrating in *their* hands the management of the whole national economy".³

Lenin stressed that most of the workers were poorly trained and at a low cultural level, and that the Right-wing elements were deceiving the working people and betraying the cause of socialism when they called for the immediate vesting of the trade unions with the right to set up administrative bodies and manage the economy. "It is quite improper for the proletariat to rush into the arms of syndicalism and talk about mandatory nominations to 'all-Russia producers' congresses'. This is dangerous and jeopardises the Party's guiding role. . . If we say that it is not the Party but the trade unions that put up the candidates and administrate, it may sound very democratic and might help us to catch a few votes, but not for long. It will be fatal for the dictatorship of the proletariat."⁴

Contrary to Bukharin's abstract and unrealistic slogans of "industrial democracy", Lenin advanced a practicable programme for drawing working people into management through the Soviets, trade unions and other mass organisa-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 426.

² Ibid., Vol. 30, p. 406.

³ Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 50.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 61, 62.

tions. He attached great importance to the trade unions, which he called a "school of communism and management".

An increasing number of people take part in management as their awareness grows and their educational and cultural level rises. This is predicated by the victory of socialism in the economy and in other social fields and by a steady consolidation of the society's material and technical basis.

Historical experience shows that the "Left" opportunist, Trotskyite approach to the working people's participation in management is also inconsistent. Although the proponents of this approach continue to hold that the "people's line" must be followed and that the "dictatorship of the proletariat must be consolidated", they are actually calling for the militarisation of the economy and the establishment of military discipline at enterprises. The Marxist-Leninist proposition of the need to combine material and moral incentives is counterbalanced by sheer administration and the militarisation of labour.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist and Workers' parties of other socialist countries act in keeping with Lenin's teaching concerning popular participation in management when they seek ways of drawing more and more working people into production decision-making. In his Report to the 24th CPSU Congress, Leonid Brezhnev stressed that this was one of the Party's most important tasks: "It is our duty to translate Lenin's behests still more fully into life and get all the workers, collective farmers and intellectuals to become conscious fighters for the implementation of the Party's economic policy, to act like statesmen and fully display their abilities, initiative and economic acumen."¹

A ramified and flexible system of working people's participation in production management has been established in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, which does not mean that they merely solve economic problems at an enterprise, as is partially the case in capitalist society, where the workers possess the right (which they won through a lengthy and intense struggle) to have a say in some activities carried on by the employers—usually only in the employers' social policy. In the socialist countries, the working people play an active part in determining economic policy

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 85-86.

on a nation-wide scale, mainly because the advanced workers, who are a key social force and the vehicles of the common social interests, carry on their activities through the Communist Party, which plays the organising and guiding role in socialist society.

The Communist Party encourages the activities of millions of Communists and non-Party members, and purposefully guides them in keeping with the Marxist-Leninist approach to management and the objective laws of socialist economic development. The Communist Party rallies numerous mass organisations round itself, and draws an increasing number of working people into management through them. Thanks to the Party's consistent work in developing the people's consciousness and raising their ideological and cultural level, an increasing number of working people take an active part in adopting decisions and fulfilling and controlling them.

The Communist parties in the socialist countries act in conjunction with the trade unions and other mass organisations when they raise key economic issues for popular discussion. This has long been true of draft economic plans, which are discussed by the staffs of enterprises and by all trade union members who supplement and improve them. Those working in individual economic sectors hold congresses and meetings on the initiative taken by Party organisations and the trade unions. The decisions adopted at the meetings (which are a form of direct democracy and working people's self-administration) strongly influence the appropriate economic bodies' policy. In conformity with the statutes of ministries and the Statute of the Socialist State Industrial Enterprise, the management of enterprises together with factory or local trade union committees regularly hold production conferences of foremost workers to discuss technological progress and economic development and work out measures to eliminate shortcomings.

The Party in general and local Party organisations in particular see to it that the economic bodies are properly staffed and that the workers are given political and vocational training. They also control the economic work of state and mass organisations. The Party's activities in developing socialist emulation are a special way of drawing working people into economic management. Lenin often stressed that socialist emulation is of great importance to socialist construction,

including the development of democracy. In *The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government*, he wrote: "It is precisely the Soviet form of organisation, by ensuring transition from the formal democracy of the bourgeois republic to real participation of the mass of working people in administration, that for the first time puts competition on a broad basis."¹

Socialist emulation has nothing in common with competition in a "market economy". Its purpose is to develop the social economy as a whole and to satisfy the working people's general economic requirements, rather than to enable every enterprise to derive as much profit as possible. It is a means of improving socialist production relations, and of inculcating a new, communist attitude to labour and drawing millions of working people into management. Lenin said that socialism made it possible for the first time ever to apply emulation "on a really wide and on a really mass scale, for actually drawing the majority of working people into a field of labour in which they can display their abilities, develop the capacities, and reveal those talents, so abundant among the people whom capitalism crushed, suppressed and strangled in thousands and millions".²

Correspondingly, the Communist Party creates conditions for socialist emulation, tries to find new forms for it, criticises its shortcomings and attacks bureaucracy wherever it is practised. In early September 1971, the Central Committee of the CPSU adopted the Resolution entitled "On Further Improvement of Socialist Emulation", designed to develop popular initiative and creative endeavour and to give an impetus to nation-wide socialist emulation in successfully carrying out economic plans and fulfilling the decisions adopted at the 24th CPSU Congress. The Resolution says that the trade unions, Party and YCL organisations, and economic and local government bodies must consistently develop the democratic principles of socialist emulation, eradicate bureaucracy in emulation, give the labour collectives a greater part to play in solving questions of emulation, and invariably fulfil Lenin's principles of its organisation by publicity and comparison of results. The Resolution states

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 259-260.

² Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 404.

that incentives, particularly moral incentives, are becoming the main driving force as communism is being built, and that they must be correctly used in developing emulation.¹

Such representative socialist bodies as the Soviets help to draw the working people into management. These agencies have the last word in the adoption of legislative acts, approval of state plans and budgets and in the elaboration of various measures aimed at their realisation. They are important because, among other things, deputies act not only as the representatives of state power when they settle economic matters, but as public leaders who represent the electorate's interests. The deputies adopt decisions and see to it that they are fulfilled. To this end, they exercise their right to make proposals, demand reports from the managers of enterprises and put questions to higher state bodies. In many socialist countries, various representative bodies have commissions for economic management. The commissions (which include industrial representatives as well as deputies) are a specific form of the working people's self-administration. They possess wide powers for studying a given sector and making proposals to the representative bodies, which must examine them and take appropriate measures.

These are just some of the forms and institutions of the working people's direct and indirect participation in economic management. But their management of the enterprises at which they apply their experience and mental and physical abilities is of even greater importance. The workers of socialist enterprises regard their work not merely as a means of earning a living and satisfying their personal requirements, but mainly as a way of helping socialist and communist construction, thus making themselves important in and to society. Socialism reveals people's best characteristics, shapes their way of life and moulds the man of the communist future. This process largely depends on production relations at individual enterprises and in society as a whole, particularly on the relations in production management.

Opportunist theorists hold that a schism exists between the administrative staff and the workers at enterprises. They contend that, since the administrative staff of socialist enterprises represent state power, they are "alienated" from and

independent of the working people, and they arbitrarily settle all economic matters.

Indeed, the administrative bodies (the management) of socialist economic organisations do represent state power in social reproduction, and they are truly the agencies of the socialist state that perform the appropriate functions. But their job is not confined to this alone. First, economic legislation vests not only the director and the administrative staff, but also the working collective as a whole, with powers to run the enterprise. Second, being a state institution, the administrative staff of socialist enterprises are a component of the collective, which cannot be regarded merely as a group of direct producers. Besides the administrative staff, which represent state power and an enterprise's workers and which must take account of their views and interests in its policy, the collective includes the workers of an enterprise, their self-administrative bodies and mass organisations. At the enterprise, the administrative staff and the workers share their responsibility on the basis of conscious discipline and co-operation, expressed above all in the participation of the workers and their representatives in all the administrative staff's activities. This participation is based on Lenin's principle of combining personal responsibility with collective leadership, which establishes broad democracy in elaborating and discussing decisions and which makes the administrators personally responsible for fulfilling them. Socialist democracy develops as the importance of collective management grows and the administrators and other members of the labour collective assume greater responsibility for the tasks entrusted to them.

As a result of the economic reform in the Soviet Union, factories and local economic bodies use more material incentives and enjoy greater rights and economic independence. This is the basis of democratising the enterprises' activities. The initiative of individual economic units cannot develop, and the collective cannot fully reveal its potentialities, without great economic independence. The collective plays a larger part in planning and organising production and intensifies control over the administrative staff's work when the latter is vested with new rights in organising production. The working collective today thus plays a bigger part in settling economic matters and developing industrial democracy when the enterprises enjoy greater independence.

¹ *Pravda*, September 5, 1971.

Soviet workers take an active part in management by drafting, adopting and fulfilling decisions and controlling their fulfilment. Their participation in drafting short- and long-term plans for an enterprise's development is of great importance. The appropriate economic bodies can approve these plans only when they have been examined either at general workers' meetings held by the collectives of enterprises and production shops or at production conferences.

In conformity with the regulations, the working collective and mass organisations of an enterprise discuss and carry out measures to ensure the fulfilment of the state plan, develop the enterprise's industrial and economic activities and improve its employees' living and working conditions. The documents of the 24th CPSU Congress emphasise the importance of the working collectives' compilation of plans for their social development. These plans envisage measures to increase labour protection, improve the workers' educational level, housing and other living conditions, and build holiday homes, nurseries and sports facilities.

The workers of industrial enterprises see to it that the administrators carry out measures to fulfil the state plan and other tasks, that is, they act as public controllers.

The workers perform these functions either directly or through various forms of representation. The institutions of direct industrial democracy include (apart from the workers' general meetings) the standing production conferences, which partake in the elaboration and discussion of short- and long-term production plans, organisational and technical measures and the use of new equipment, industrial plans, and plans for housing construction and building cultural and public amenities. The conferences also examine reports by the administrators of enterprises and production shops concerning the fulfilment of these plans and the proposals for bettering inner-factory planning, working conditions and the quality of output and for organising production, raising wages, eliminating spoilage and carrying out recommendations by inventors and other proposals made with a view to improving the enterprise's work. The Statute of the Socialist State Industrial Enterprise binds the administrative staff to help the production conferences in their work and to see to it that their decisions are fulfilled. Among other things, the administrative staff must see to it that the shortcomings indicated by the produc-

tion conference in the work of the enterprise, production shops and individual workers are eliminated.

The standing production conferences consist of permanent members elected at general meetings by those working at production shops and departments, and by Party and YCL organisations, the trade unions and the administration. The production conference elects a board to look after everyday work. Over 138,000 production conferences operate today in the Soviet Union, with more than five million participants, two-thirds of whom are workers.

Other forms of the working people's participation in the management of production are also developed in every possible way to give free rein to the working people's initiative and allow them to exert stronger influence on an enterprise's economic policy. For instance, the enterprise must provide every opportunity to enable scientific and technical societies and the local organisations of the All-Union Society of Inventors and Rationalisers to carry on their work. This also applies to design, technological and standard-making bureaus, innovators' councils, laboratories, and economic departments and groups working on a voluntary basis. It must provide them with premises, equipment, instruments and technical and reference literature. By their activities, these organisations help to improve the organisation and efficiency of production and the quality of the output.

In the Soviet Union, the factory trade union committees play an important part in managing socialist industrial enterprises. They represent the interests of those working at a given enterprise in settling questions that concern working conditions, culture and everyday life, and the working people take part in managing production through them. Leonid Brezhnev said that "the Party will continue giving constant support to the trade unions as the largest organisations of the working people and seeing to it that they are able to fulfil their role of school of administration, school of economic management and school of communism more fully and successfully".¹

The factory trade union committees (which represent virtually all working people) take an effective part in management due both to their authority and to the fact that, under existing legislation, the administrative staff can perform

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 95-96.

many important functions only with the participation of local trade union committees. The Statute on the Rights of the Factory and Office Trade Union Committees, adopted in October 1971, vests the trade union committees with the right to take part, together with the administrative staff, in distributing the material incentives fund and the fund for social and cultural measures and housing construction and in approving the amount to be spent from these funds. The administrative staff redistributes finance between these funds only with the trade union committee's consent. The management must act in conjunction with the trade union committee when it determines the amount of bonus, material assistance and annual payments. The management and the trade union committee establish work rules containing disciplinary and incentive measures, award bonuses and lump-sum grants, and distribute the living space of the houses that belong to their enterprise and the living space that is put at the enterprise's disposal in other houses. They also organise socialist emulation, discuss its results, determine its winners and reward foremost workers and collectives.

The trade unions take a very active part in elaborating and realising economic plans, solving labour problems and establishing bodies for the economic management of enterprises. At the factory committee's meetings, the administrators make reports on draft plans, the results of industrial and economic activities, the fulfilment of plans, the obligations arising from the Collective Agreement, and the measures taken to improve working conditions, provide the working people with cultural and welfare facilities and eliminate shortcomings at work. The administrative staff must examine and take account of the proposals made by the trade union committees on production plans and the working people's labour, cultural and everyday life, and must take measures to carry out these proposals. The factory committee has the right to see that the approved proposals are fulfilled. This particularly applies to the decisions passed by the trade union committee to control the management's observance of labour legislation, safety regulations, industrial sanitation and other matters on which they must adopt decisions together with the local factory trade union committees or with their consent.

When need be, the trade union committee asks the ap-

propriate organisations to replace or punish administrators who do not fulfil the obligations arising from the Collective Agreement or who tolerate bureaucracy and violate labour legislation. The administrators take account of the committee's views when they appoint managerial staff.

The trade union committees have the legal right to make proposals to the higher standing economic and local government bodies for improving the enterprise's work and working conditions and for providing the working people with cultural and welfare facilities.

The trade unions are thus a medium through which the working people take part in production management and the distribution of an enterprise's income (especially the material incentives funds).

As we have seen, public control is an important form of the working people's management of production. Economic organisations and their units have many public controllers who help to preclude inefficiency and the violation of state and production discipline and socialist legality at enterprises. They may study documents concerning an enterprise's state of affairs, question those responsible for economic mismanagement and bureaucracy and take measures of public censure against them. The local public control bodies report on their findings to the management, Party and other mass organisations of an enterprise. The management must help people's controllers in their work, examine their proposals and take the necessary steps to eliminate shortcomings. People's controllers see to it that their proposals are fulfilled and report back on their findings to the working collective.

The forms of the working people's participation in the management of production are developing in other socialist countries as well. The Constitution of the German Democratic Republic says: "The working people shall take part in the management of enterprises, whose work is the basis of the creation and the increase of social wealth, either directly or through their elected bodies." Production committees at enterprises, scientific and economic councils at plants and public councils at the people's amalgamated enterprises play an important part in economic management in the GDR.

In Poland, the scope of the conferences of worker self-administration is increasing. In Yugoslavia, workers' councils play an extremely important part, and so on.

The forms of the working people's participation in the management of production are being invariably improved in socialist countries. Effective ways are found to encourage the working people to be more active, and conditions are created to give free rein to their initiative and enable them to take a bigger part in the management of production. These ways result from the objective course of social development, steady improvement of the working people's well-being, growth in their consciousness, and wider application of the standards of communist community life.

CHAPTER III

THE ROLE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND SOCIO-POLITICAL ORGANISATIONS

1. Communist Party Leadership as an Objective Law of Socialist Construction

The modern Right opportunist adversaries of socialist democracy attack the leading role played by the Communist parties in the socialist states in building a new, exploiter-free society. The ruling Communist parties are accused of "usurping" power and establishing "totalitarian" regimes. The Communist parties' leading role is alleged to be incompatible with "democratic" socialism and "self-administrative" democracy.

Such attacks on the Marxist-Leninist conception of the Party's leading role are mainly launched along two directions. Some critics cast doubt on the correctness of this conception, because it does not evidently conform to the contemporary level of socialist development. Antonín Liehm, a theorist of the Czechoslovak Right forces, wrote in 1968: "The Party's leading role is regarded as indisputable question, as a moral and political right; but the CPCz's leading role is a most disputable question."¹

Ivan Sviták, another Right opportunist ideologist, expressed more or less the same view when he said that the "Communist Party's leading role, in the way it has taken shape during the last twenty years in Eastern Europe, is politically unsound".²

Other revisionists invent differences in the views of Marx and Lenin to distort the teaching on the role of the Party. They hold that only the party which corresponds to the one

¹ *Events in Czechoslovakia. Facts, Documents, Press Reports and Eye-Witness Accounts*, Book I, Moscow, 1968, p. 14 (in Russian).

² *Ibid.*

given in Marx's concept can conform to the conditions of a "self-administrative socialist society", and that Lenin's concept is a far cry from Marx's one, since the former is based on the "social rule of the workers' party, which rests on the state principle and which replaces the socialist social system".¹ Hence the appeals to "return to the party as understood by Marx". Such theorists do not seriously examine the substance of the views held by Marx and Lenin on the role of the Communist Party, for if they did, they would see that they coincide on all basic principles. The Right revisionist ideologists speculate on the argument that Marxism and Leninism are opposed to one another so as to conceal their departure from Marxism and Leninism and ideologically to substantiate a desire to "eliminate the Party monopoly", "remove the Party from power", "turn the Party from a ruling into a leading organisation", and so on.

The bourgeoisie, the reformists and revisionists increasingly attack the Marxist-Leninist parties' leading role because, as historical experience has shown, it is a reliable and immutable basis of the socialist system and a pledge of successful communist construction. But anti-Communists of all types cannot reconcile themselves to this. As Leonid Brezhnev has said in his Report at the 24th CPSU Congress, the battle between Marxists-Leninists and revisionists is centering on the Communist Party's leading role.

Marx's and Lenin's teaching on the party is a single doctrine which is creatively developed in the Communists' theoretical and practical work today. One of its most important propositions is that Communist Party leadership in socialist countries is as natural a product as was the Communist Party leadership of the workers' revolutionary struggle.

Marx has shown that the transition from capitalism to socialism is a historical necessity owing to objective social laws. He wrote that the proletariat was the grave-digger of capitalism and the builder of socialism and communism, and that it was an "urgent, no longer disguised, absolutely imperative need—that practical expression of necessity".² But historical necessity has never arisen without the people's creative revolutionary activities. Since the proletariat must

¹ *Events in Czechoslovakia...*, Book I, p. 14.

² Marx, Engels, *The Holy Family, or Critique of Critical Critique*, Moscow, 1956, p. 52.

realise this necessity of the transition from capitalism to socialism, their Marxist-Leninist vanguard is a very important subjective factor that ensures the victory of the socialist revolution.¹ The numerous revolutions have shown that the Communist Party alone is capable of bringing the proletariat's class struggle to a complete victory: to the establishment of its political power in society. The Communist Party alone can combine scientific socialism with the proletariat's movement, fully express the proletariat's political, economic and other interests and thus help it clearly see its historical aims and the ways of achieving them. The Communist Party alone can unite the proletariat into an organised social force which can withstand bourgeois propaganda and the splitting activities of the reformists and opportunists and which will ultimately destroy the entire bourgeois machinery of oppression. Only under the guidance of the Communist Party can the proletariat rally round itself other sections of the working people, primarily the peasantry, and head the alliance of the working people, without which capitalism cannot be overthrown.

In a multinational state, the future of the socialist revolution largely depends on the correct solution of the national question, which is one of the cardinal questions of socialist construction. The establishment of the world's first multinational socialist state is an important result of the revolutionary activities carried on by all the Soviet peoples led by the working class and guided by the Communist Party. The Resolution of the CC CPSU of February 21, 1972, says that only the Communist Party, which expresses the vital in-

¹ In their efforts to discredit the Communist Party's role, modern revisionists try to prove that the Party is being replenished by the strata other than the workers, maintaining that the proletariat is "disappearing" or that it "is being transformed" in the developed capitalist countries. Herbert Marcuse holds that the working class is being transformed in its class structure "owing to the assimilation of the employers and the wage workers and the co-operation of capital and the workers' trade unions and of the trade unions and the government", and that the "proletariat and the revolutionary proletarian class consciousness, as Marx understood them, are disappearing" (*Praxis*, 1970, br. 3, str. 335). The powerful workers' revolutionary struggle in the capitalist world today refutes the revisionists' argument, which apparently must be of great importance to bourgeois society. Such revisionist theorists as Franz Marek base themselves on this argument and urge the working class and its party to "renounce all claims to the leading role" and "all monopoly of revolutionary wisdom" (*ibid.*, br. 1-2, str. 181).

terests of the working class, of all the working people, and which pursues the Leninist nationalities policy, was able to unite all nations and nationalities into a single international brotherhood and direct their efforts towards the establishment of the new society. It has honourably fulfilled its historic task, because it was steadily guided by Marxism-Leninism.¹

Lenin developed the Marxist teaching on the party by excellently solving, under the new historical conditions, several very difficult problems which faced the revolutionary working-class movement. He also set up a new type of a revolutionary party, the Bolshevik Party, in Russia.

The experience gained in social and particularly world socialist construction clearly shows that Lenin's concepts on the Communist Party's role in organising socialist society politically are of world-wide historic importance. His teaching has not a local, purely Russian character. It helps to improve state organisation, law and the machinery of socialist social administration by revealing the general laws of the revolutionary transformation of society. The working class of the world have set up a powerful front consisting of Communist parties, which head the nation-wide struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, by using this teaching as a guide and by creatively applying it to the given historical conditions.

At the turn of the century, when the Russian proletariat started the struggle against the capitalist and landowner system and when the country was becoming the centre of the world revolutionary movement, Lenin advanced extremely important propositions on the Communist Party's mission in the revolutionary movement and the forms and methods of its activities. In 1900, he wrote that, without the party, "the proletariat will never rise to the class-conscious struggle; without such organisation the working-class movement is doomed to impotency", and that "not a single class in history has achieved power without producing its political leaders, its prominent representatives able to organise a movement and lead it".²

The Bolshevik Party, which consisted mainly of profes-

sional revolutionaries, waged a difficult underground struggle owing to tsarist suppression in Russia. To save the Party, Lenin and his associates had to restrict its membership and camouflage its activities. At the same time, Lenin stressed that contacts with the working people had to be increased and that the Party had to be put in the van of the revolutionary movement. He said that the "Party must be only the vanguard, the leader of the vast masses of the working class, the whole (or nearly the whole) of which works 'under the control and direction' of the Party organisations, but the whole of which does not and should not belong to a 'party' ".¹

As the revolutionary movement developed in Russia, mass organisations of workers and peasants were set up under Bolshevik guidance to unite the working people for a decisive offensive against the tsarist regime.

The Russian Socialist-Revolutionaries' and Menshevik leaders often tried to cast doubt on the Bolsheviks' ability to become a ruling party. They tried to make the people distrustful of Lenin's party, holding that it could not guide social development.

Lenin published several works to refute the arguments advanced by his ill-starred critics. He showed that the Bolsheviks, who numbered 240,000 members in September, 1917, could rule better than the 130,000 landowners and capitalists who, in fact, held power after the 1905 revolution. Lenin wrote: "We have a 'magic way' to enlarge our state apparatus *tenfold* at once, at one stroke, a way which no capitalist state ever possessed or could possess. This magic way is to draw the working people, to draw the poor, into the daily work of state administration."²

The victory of the October Socialist Revolution, enabled Lenin to develop further his teaching on the Communist Party's role in society and its relation to the state. The dictatorship of the proletariat made the Bolshevik Party the ruling party. Many difficult problems therefore had to be solved in respect of the Party itself and its composition, on the one hand, and the ways of guiding the Soviets and the state machinery of the world's first socialist state, on the other. These questions, raised when the revolutionary gains were being consolidated and when the basis of the socialist system

¹ *The 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 7-8 (in Russian).

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 370.

¹ Ibid., Vol. 6, p. 502.

² Ibid., Vol. 26, pp. 111-112.

was being laid, had to be correctly solved so as to develop the political guidance of society.

Lenin elaborated his ideas on the Party's leading and guiding role during an intense and relentless struggle waged against those who tried to depart from the revolutionary teaching and distort the communist theory's substance and aims. Lenin often said that experience gained in the struggle against the Mensheviks, Trotskyites, bourgeois nationalists and Right opportunists showed that the workers and their Party must always be on guard against anti-Marxist distortions by Right and "Left" elements and must defend the purity of their ranks, principles and aims.

Lenin regarded his proposition on the Party's leading role as crucial in the science of socialist and communist construction. He never made subjectivist conclusions and circumstantial assessments of the main trends of social development before and after the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. He cautioned against marking time and observing hard-and-fast formulas and dogmatic and schematic principles, and against forestalling events and advancing unrealistic slogans. His ideas on the Communist Party and its guidance of the socialist state have been both substantiated and tested in world socialist construction. They helped Communist parties in several countries to lead the people's revolutionary movement during and after the Second World War, gain victory in popular democratic revolutions and turn them into socialist revolutions. This process culminated in the establishment of the world socialist system.

The working class' victory in the revolution naturally makes it the leader of the society and turns its party into the ruling party. The Communists' assumption of power is therefore not a "seizure of power", as the bourgeois ideologists would have us believe. The modern Right revisionist theorists are wrong when they hold that this assumption is necessary only at the initial stage of socialist construction. They simply want to justify their opportunist policy of eliminating the Communist Party's role.

They contend that the construction of socialism is a spontaneous development of its various elements, and that any "interference" in this development is harmful. They therefore call for the unimpeded action of the law of value, the free play of "political forces", the "uncontrolled electoral process", "direct self-administrative democracy" and the

"removal of the Party from power". A striking example of this is the demand to make the Party a "discussion club" and vest it only with educational functions.

The Right revisionist ideologists thus base their ideas on various bourgeois concepts of the "neutralism" of political power, "free play of political forces", and so on, rather than on the Marxist-Leninist theory of the socialist state and the Party. Hence, they revise Marxism from a bourgeois and petty-bourgeois standpoint. They ignore the fact that the Marxist-Leninist party plays the leading role not because its leaders wish it, but because the socialist society's development demands it. The Communist Party guidance is an objective need for the proletarian revolution; its guidance of socialist and communist construction is a historical law.

Communist Party guidance of social development, of the building of a classless society is a key principle of scientific communism and a major law of socialist construction. Proceeding from Lenin's teaching and the experience gained in socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the CPSU has come to the conclusion, which is supported by the Communists in the world that the working class plays the leading part not only during the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also at all subsequent stages of socialist construction until a communist social system is established. The founders of Marxism were correct when they said that the establishment of communism was the historic mission of the working class.

It is the working class which is connected most closely with large-scale machine-building industry that is the key industry in economic development. This objectively calls for high organisational efficiency, a higher cultural and educational level of the workers, and their progressive influence on other sections of the population. The working class, which is the vehicle of the most progressive production relations, ideology and morality, has conscious discipline, understands class and social interests, and can subordinate its personal interests to those of the entire people. The working people's social psychology is gradually formed on the basis of the social psychology of the working class.

The working class actively implements new scientific achievements, which calls for great knowledge, close co-operation with engineers and researchers and direct participation in technical endeavour. Moreover, the workers con-

tinually meet the requirements of technological progress and accelerate the revolution in science and technology. The leading role of the working class in politics, ideology and culture is thus growing, as a result of which society is advancing towards communism.

Anti-Communists have recently intensified their attacks on the working class in the socialist countries so as to disarm it ideologically and undermine the unity of the Communist Party, which is its vanguard. In unison with these attacks, Right revisionists often write that the working class has lost its revolutionary qualities, freedom of action and creative initiative, and that it cannot guide social progress. Franz Marek writes: "All power is being concentrated in the Party leadership's hands, i.e., instead of power being in the hands of the working class, the latter is in the hands of Party power.... Instead of being the ruling class, it is again becoming a means of manipulation in various campaigns and parliamentary activities."¹ Reality, however, refutes such allegations. Social development under contemporary conditions enhances the working class' qualities which allow it to hold the key place in society.

That place of the working class is being consolidated, because the class is in the van of social progress and is its main motive force. Being a vehicle of Marxism-Leninism, the working class tackles all social problems on strict scientific lines and with revolutionary dynamism. Class egoism and social narrowness are alien to the activities of the working class which expresses and realises the vital interests of all the working people.

In the socialist countries, the working class runs social affairs not only through the Communist Party, but also through the entire mechanism of socialist democracy. The Communist Party fully expresses the will and interests of the working class and includes its most conscientious and influential representatives. The Theses of the Central Committee of the CPSU on the Centenary of Lenin's Birth said: "The guiding and organising activities of the Marxist-Leninist party are the main condition for the working class to exert decisive influence on the development of the new society."²

¹ *Socializam*, 1969, br. 9, str. 1193.

² Supplement to *New Times* No. 1, 1970.

Other objective causes, which operate in socialist society and which once gave rise to the need to establish the Party, now require the Party to play an even greater role. To build socialism, the management of social development must be purposeful and systematic and the laws of social development must be consciously applied at various stages of socialist construction. The Communist Party alone can do this, since its activities are based on a scientific understanding of the course and prospects of socialist development. The CPSU Programme says: "The Communist Party, which unites the foremost representatives of the working class, of all working people, and is closely connected with the masses, which enjoys unbounded prestige among the people and understands the laws of social development, provides proper leadership in communist construction as a whole, giving it an organised, planned and scientifically based character."¹ The Communist Party studies the laws of social development so as to transform reality, overcome contradictions, steadily improve the people's well-being, raise their cultural level and make them politically aware. Since the activities carried on by the Party are based on scientific theory, they are not susceptible to narrow-class, national, religious and other influences.

The Communist Party is the only party which is interested in developing social sciences in every possible way and which makes them a means of understanding the processes of social development. The various aspects of social development are being increasingly studied, social experiments are being carried out and generalised, and scientific achievements are being put to use under the Communist Party's direct guidance. Lenin said that the "*role of vanguard fighter can be fulfilled only by a party that is guided by the most advanced theory*".²

Communists are following Lenin's example by consistently maintaining the purity of revolutionary theory and waging a relentless struggle against those who deviate from the principles of scientific socialism and who try to distort this theory, regardless of whether they advance Right or "Left" slogans. Lenin correctly assessed the merits of those fighting for socialism and highlighted the most important aspects

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 583.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 370.

of their activities against the background of errors and temporary vacillations. At the same time, he roundly condemned theories and activities harmful to the socialist cause, regardless of their perpetrators.

Lenin took a creative approach, free from dogmatism and schematism, to the revolutionary teaching, which he invariably tried to develop and enrich by generalising the experience gained by the workers in their efforts to make the socialist revolution victorious and build socialism. Soon after the Bolshevik Party was set up, Lenin wrote: "We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life."¹

Lenin gave examples of such an approach to Marxism: he advanced and substantiated the proposition that socialism can win first in one country, and showed that the Soviet Republic was a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin creatively developed Marx's and Engels' concepts, worked out a coherent teaching of the national question, elaborated the scientific principles of the Communist Party's nationalities policy and virtually established a multinational socialist state.² He laid the basis of both socialist political economy and the socialist state and law, and made it possible to solve complex problems in other Marxist social sciences. His creative legacy is an inexhaustible source from which the international communist movement derives strength.

The 24th CPSU Congress clearly showed how new problems were being solved creatively and how experience was being scientifically analysed. The Congress, which greatly contributed toward the development of the Marxist-Leninist theory, made a profound analysis of the present-day revolution in science and technology and set the historic task of organically combining the revolution's achievements with the socialist system's advantages. The participants in the Congress agreed that today the main task of socialist construction in the Soviet Union is to improve the working

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 211-212.

² *The 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 4-5 (in Russian).

people's well-being by rapidly developing socialist production and raising its effectiveness, promoting progress in science and technology and increasing labour productivity. The task is to improve economic management as the objective need of a mature socialist society. Leonid Brezhnev said at the Congress that social activities must be organised in the best possible way so as to accelerate social and economic development, that existing potentialities must be used most fully, and that the main aims of Party policy must be achieved with the help of millions of working people.

The Congress emphasised the paramount importance of progressive revolutionary theory, without which the Party cannot play the leading role. Marxism-Leninism will always be the basis of the Party's transforming activities, but a creative approach has to be made to its main propositions. The CC CPSU Report to the Congress said: "Repetition of old formulas where they have become outworn and an inability or reluctance to adopt a new approach to new problems harm the cause and create additional possibilities for the spread of revisionist counterfeits of Marxism-Leninism. Criticism of bourgeois and revisionist attacks on our theory and practice becomes much more convincing when it is founded on the active and creative development of the social sciences, of Marxist-Leninist theory."¹

The Communist Party's role and place in socialist society also stem from the fact that the Party consists of the most conscientious and active workers, as well as peasants, working intellectuals and other sections of the population. The Communist Party has gradually developed from a working-class party into a party of the entire people, which is something that no other party in the world can boast of. The CPSU Programme said that "as a result of the victory of socialism in the USSR and the consolidation of the unity of Soviet society, the Communist Party of the working class has become the vanguard of the Soviet people, a Party of the entire people, and extended its guiding influence to all spheres of social life".² But the Party does not lose its former, proletarian nature. This is evident from the Party Programme, the social composition of the Party and its entire activity. All the other working people and sections

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 123-124.

² *The Road to Communism*, pp. 582-583.

in society are gradually taking the stand of the working class, are rising to its level by sharing its ideology, aims and tasks.

The Communist Party develops into a party of the entire people as a result of society's gradual transformation along socialist lines, the steady expansion of its social basis, its growing prestige and stronger ties with the people, who see ever more clearly that only this party can help them build a society of human ideals.

One cannot agree with attempts to regard the Communist Party as an organisation which represents only a certain, though progressive part of society and, moreover, with counterposing the Party to the state, the National Front or other similar mass political associations which, as the authors of "democratic socialism" maintain, are the only representatives of the society. The authors of this concept give the Communist Party the same part to play as all other mass organisations.

The socialist state is an all-embracing organisation which includes the entire population of a country. Such organisations as the National Front unite only the politically active part of the population, but they are larger than the Communist Party membership and broader by social composition. The Communist Party unites only the progressive, most conscientious and organised part of society and expresses the interests of most working people.

Lenin often stressed that the workers' party pursues its policy in full conformity with all the working people's interests, and that in its activities it takes account of the interests of the broad sections of the working population. He wrote: "In the sea of people we are after all but a drop in the ocean, and we can administer only when we express correctly what the people are conscious of. Unless we do this the Communist Party will not lead the proletariat, the proletariat will not lead the masses, and the whole machine will collapse."¹

This does not mean that the Communist Party trails in the wake of the people, adapts itself to spontaneous movements and supports backward trends. Communists always adhere to the principles of their teaching, do not hide their mistakes and shortcomings from the people, and aspire for

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 304.

progress. Lenin said that the Party believes its task "is to lead the masses and not merely to reflect the average political level of the masses".¹

The Communists of the world have approved the conclusion that the working-class party will become the party of the entire people when socialism is built. In his report at the Tenth Party Congress, the First Secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party, Todor Zhivkov, said: "While remaining a working-class party, the Communist Party gradually becomes the vanguard of the people, the party of the entire people. This objective process does not belittle the leading role of the working class, nor does it replace Marxist-Leninist concepts by petty-bourgeois concepts, nor confuse the communist ideal with Narodism or abstract humanism. We strongly denounce the allegations made by dogmatists and extremists that the intellectuals, peasants or young people could play the role of the working class, and the Right opportunist assertions that the working class is merging with other social sections or dissolving in them. The Communist Party remains the party of the working class and at the same time gradually becomes the party of the entire people in the course of building a mature socialist society."

This conclusion and other scientific and practical achievements made by the CPSU and the fraternal Communist parties in developing socialist democracy are not to the liking of the "Left" opportunists. The Maoists do not recognise the dialectics of social development and denounce the principle of a concrete historical approach to social phenomena. They accuse the CPSU of abandoning the "class approach", and hold that it has lost its "proletarian nature". The CPSU has never been a narrow, exclusive grouping closed to the broad sections of the working people. It is a party of the working class who invariably aspires to lead all the working people, and it can be joined by all who share its outlook. The first programme of the CPSU said: "Since the exploited population and all sections of the working people are taking the proletarian stand, the party of the working class, Social-Democracy, calls on them to join its ranks."²

Since its inception, the Communist Party is characterised

¹ Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 324.

² *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee*, Part I, p. 39 (in Russian).

by its indissoluble ties with the people. Marxists-Leninists have always frustrated efforts to separate the Party from the people, isolate it from society and oppose it to the people. Lenin said that when the minority (the Communist Party) "is unable to lead the masses and establish close links with them, then it is not a party and is worthless in general, even if it calls itself a party".¹ In its activities, the Communist Party takes account of the fact that the people are the motive force of history and that society cannot be radically transformed without their support. It therefore tries its best to develop the people's initiative, draw them into social and state administration and democratise social life in general. The Party does not keep anything from the people, and its activities are under their strict control. It tries to give them full information on inner-Party and state life, and submits the drafts of the major state and Party documents for nation-wide discussion.

Communists are always in the thick of social life. At the most difficult sectors, they show examples of hard work and socio-political activity, and use their authority to help eliminate shortcomings, adopt correct decisions and widely employ progressive experience. Communist Party organisations educate the people ideologically, form their communist consciousness and instill communist morality and ideals. The Party wants to see the working people build their life in a communist way and fully understand the course and prospects of world development.

The Communist Party attaches great importance to its numerical strength, which expresses the extent of its prestige and influence among the people. After a proletarian revolution, its ranks swell owing to its greater authority, stronger ties with the people and the need to solve practical problems in socialist construction.

In April 1917, the Russian Bolshevik Party had 80,000 members, but when it held its Seventh Congress (March 1918), it had about 400,000 members.² In all socialist countries, the Marxist-Leninist parties turned from organisations consisting mainly of professional revolutionaries (whose

ranks were especially thin in countries where the Communists waged an underground struggle) into mass parties whose numerical strength continually grew.

The Marxist-Leninist Party must naturally have a large membership if it is to guide society, place cadres at all sections of socialist construction and consolidate its ties with the people. It must replenish its ranks and draw progressive socialist builders into its work. The growth of its numerical strength improves its social composition. The CPSU currently has about 15 million members. Leonid Brezhnev said that it was an "army which won historical victories: it overthrew the autocracy and capitalism, built socialism and started to construct communism".³

At the same time the Communist Party is constantly aware that it is dangerous to replace individual admission of members by mass enrolment. When the Leninist principles are not observed, the Party and its ideological unity can be undermined, its militant and organisational efficiency can be impaired, fellow travellers and persons having nothing in common with communist ideals can penetrate it. Lenin said: "It is not difficult to be a revolutionary when revolution has already broken out and is in spate, when all people are joining the revolution just because they are carried away, because it is the vogue, and sometimes even from careerist motives. After its victory, the proletariat has to make most strenuous efforts, even the most painful, so as to 'liberate' itself from such pseudo-revolutionaries."⁴

The 24th CPSU Congress accentuated the need to improve the qualitative composition of the Party ranks and denounced excessive preoccupation with the enrolment of new members and an indiscriminate approach. The Congress Report said: "Our task is to exert a regulating influence on the growth of the Party ranks, replenish them on the basis of individual selection of the most worthy representatives of the working class, the collective-farm peasantry and the intelligentsia, and to make sure that the Party composition allows the CPSU to carry out its tasks in the best possible way."⁵

The Marxist-Leninist principle of Communist Party guid-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 238.

² *History of the CPSU*, Vol. 3, Book I, Moscow, 1967, p. 540 (in Russian).

¹ *Pravda*, January 4, 1969.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 97.

³ *24th Congress of the CPSU*, pp. 111-112.

ance is central to socialist social development. Various anti-socialist elements will mount a counter-revolutionary offensive when the Party reduces its leading role even slightly or when it vacillates on this question. This was true of Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. The Theses On the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin, said: "Lenin warned, and experience shows, that any attempt to weaken the leading role of the Party is fraught with the danger of anti-socialist anarchy, holds the threat of the restoration of the capitalist order."¹

In his speech at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow, the First Secretary of the CC CPCz Gustav Husák drew attention to the developments since January 1968 that "gave rise to substantial negative tendencies connected with an activation of anti-socialist forces, which fact the leadership of our Party underestimated at the time.... Socialist power based on the leading role of the Communist Party was gravely endangered.... Right opportunist and partly anti-socialist forces tended to paralyse the influence of the Party, to mislead Communists and the population, and gradually vitiate the main values and principles of socialism."²

"Left" deviationist views on the Party's role are also a menace to revolutionary changes. At first sight, they appear to be the antithesis of the Right-wing revisionist concepts, since they absolutise and "governmentalise" the Party's role and make its leadership's directives binding on all. In fact, however, the "Left" revisionists try to reduce to nought the Party as a special type of workers' organisation which must guide the socialist state but not administer society instead of the state or merge with it.

It is not difficult to see the harm that the Right and "Left" splitters do to the communist movement. The Marxists-Leninists of the world seek to preserve the purity of their ranks, creatively develop that revolutionary teaching and consolidate ties with all working people. They oppose all forms of opportunism, revisionism and "Left" sectarian dogmatism.

¹ Supplement to *New Times* No. 1, January 1, 1970.

² *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, Prague, 1969, pp. 408, 409.

2. Forms and Methods of Communist Party Guidance

To deny the leading role of the Communist Party in socialist society is only one of the ways in which revisionists criticise the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the Party. At the present stage of socialist construction when practice itself shows that progress cannot be made without Party guidance, the direct attacks on the Party's guiding role are being increasingly replaced by efforts to distort the forms, methods and principles of this guidance and recommend that they be "improved" or replaced by other, more "democratic" ones. This revisionist trend is more veiled, but it is also ultimately aimed at discrediting and undermining the Party's role in socialist society and at introducing elements of the bourgeois pluralist party system into Marxist theory and practice.

Right-wing revisionists attack the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the Communist Party is the leading nucleus of the entire political system of socialism, and that it is called upon to unite and channel the efforts of public and state organisations towards one goal, to see to it that the entire social system and all its components function normally.

That scientific proposition is not to the liking of the Right-wing revisionist authors of new "models" of socialism. The champions of "direct socialist democracy" call for the "separation of the Party from power", the establishment of "non-Party political democracy", and the turning of the Party from a guiding and organising force into a "leading moral and political force", an "ideological factor" and an "integral part of the self-administrative system". They hold that the Party must limit its functions to a mere supervision and study of social processes, existing problems and various interests so that it can determine its stand on a particular question, support certain interests or solutions and differ on other interests and solutions. But they maintain that its stand must be pursued on the "strength of its prestige".

This concept obviously deprives the Party of its organisational function (which is one of its most important functions) and gives it only an ideological and educational role. The Party—socialist society's political vanguard—is thus reduced to a "moral" organisation. It is dissolved among other socio-political institutions and is prevented from leading the working people. This is intended to make the Party an organisa-

tion which is a far cry from the one envisaged by the founders of Marxism-Leninism.

Lenin often emphasised the indissolubility and unity of the Party's politico-ideological and organisational activities, regarding this as an essential unity between theory and practice. He said that "every organisational question assumes a political significance",¹ and that "political questions cannot be mechanically separated from organisation questions".² Without organisational activities, without carrying out and implementing its ideology, the Party cannot cope with the intricate tasks of guiding socialist and communist construction. The Party would inevitably become a "discussion club" by carrying on only ideological and educational activities, and it would not safeguard the interests of the workers and all the other working people.

The opportunist proponents of the concepts of "humane" and "democratic" socialism even deny that the Communist Party has a "moral advantage", and call for "equal partnership" and free play of all political forces. The Communist Party is thus put on an equal footing with other parties and organisations. These conceptions have been influenced by such Western revisionists as Ernst Fischer, who contend that instead of being leaders of the revolutionary forces, the Communist parties should become an appendage of the "New Left".

Social activities, and especially the experience of world socialism, show that such conceptions are harmful and theoretically inconsistent. The Party's departure from the Marxist-Leninist methods of guidance is tantamount to its renunciation of its leading position in socialist society. This was borne out by the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia, when the refusal to carry out Party decisions became one of the main reasons why its prestige was impaired and its role in the guidance of social processes gradually decreased.

Working on the fulfilment of Party decisions, state and public institutions do not confine their activities to this alone. Had that been the case, all the institutions of the political system would actually become Party organs.

Anti-Communists and Right-wing revisionists single out

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 443.
² Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 316.

only this aspect of socialist political relations, and exaggerating it contend that the Party is being "governmentalised" and "has taken the place" of state and social bodies, that the "dictatorship of the Party" has been established, and so on. These allegations distort socialist theory and practice.

Lenin often stressed that the state organisation, as well as the trade unions, co-operatives, and youth and other public institutions played a special part in society by linking the Party with the people, and the people with the Party. He said that the Party cannot guide society if it does not know the people's needs and aspirations and does not express the interests of the various sections of the working people in its activities.

The Communist Party guides state and public bodies, but does not replace them, as the revisionists maintain. This is emphasised in all the fraternal parties' important documents, especially in their Rules.

The Rules of the CPSU say that the "Party organisations must not act in place of government, trade union, co-operative or other mass organisations of the working people; they must not allow either the merging of the functions of Party and other bodies or undue parallelism in work."¹

In practice, Party organisations cannot always observe this principle and avoid replacement, duplication and petty guardianship of public organisations and economic and state bodies. But the Party is aware of these shortcomings and consistently tries to eliminate them.

Lenin drew attention to this fact. In preparing a report to the Eleventh Congress of the RCP(B), he wrote: "It is necessary to delimit much more precisely the functions of the Party (and of its Central Committee) from those of the Soviet government; to increase the responsibility and independence of Soviet officials and of Soviet government institutions, leaving to the Party the general guidance of the activities of all state bodies, without the present, too frequent, irregular, and often petty interference."²

The Programme of the RCP(B), adopted at the Eighth Party Congress, said in respect of relations between the Party and the Soviets: "The functions of the Party collectives must in no way be confused with the functions of the state bodies,

¹ *The Road to Communism*, p. 613.
² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 253.

such as the Soviets. This confusion would be disastrous, especially to the science of war. The Party must carry out its decisions through the Soviet bodies, *within the framework of the Soviet Constitution*. The Party seeks to guide the Soviets in their activities, but not to replace them.¹

These shortcomings therefore do not deprive the Party of its leading role in its relations with public and state bodies. The Party has to overcome them and effect its guidance in more democratic forms, raise the scientific level of this guidance and see to it that its decisions are carried out more fully by developing the initiative of all the socio-political institutions and giving them greater independence. Some contemporary authors try to deny the importance of the Marxist-Leninist principles of administering socialist society. But these principles are not at variance with the democratic way in which the socialist political systems function. They are the basis and guarantee of democracy in administration.

The Party's relations with mass organisations may be exemplified by the development of Party guidance of trade unions. The Party invariably helps the trade unions in their work and creates the necessary conditions for their activities. On the initiative of the CC CPSU, laws were recently passed which extended the powers of the trade unions especially those which directly concern the working people's interests. *The Fundamentals of Labour Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics*, adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the *Statute on the Rights of the Factory and Office Trade Union Committees*, are of paramount importance. In his speech at the 15th Trade Union Congress on March 20, 1972, Leonid Brezhnev said that "Party organisations must help trade unions by supporting them in their demands justly made on economic workers, and by seeing to it that the managers invariably observe collective agreements, consult with trade unions and take into account views held by factory and office workers".²

The parties must continually raise the question of "replacement" owing to objective causes, such as inefficiency of the state and economic bodies in their work, unsatisfac-

¹ *The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee*, Part I, 1953, p. 446 (in Russian).

² L. Brezhnev, *Decisions of the 24th CPSU Congress: Militant Programme of the Soviet Trade Unions' Activities*, 1972, p. 13 (in Russian).

tory fulfilment of their tasks by social organs and inadequate development of the working people's initiative and activities. And the parties are eliminating these shortcomings. The Party organisations are now attaching greater importance to the effectiveness of their work, mainly through influencing the people, transforming their consciousness, instilling a keen sense of duty, and analysing the Communists' work, their contribution to the fulfilment of specific tasks and their responsibility for the common cause. This is all ultimately expressed in the results of economic activities and the fulfilment of plans, but only after being refracted through the prism of human consciousness and human relations: the main objects of Party work.

The Party and state bodies' sphere of activities naturally cannot be completely delineated from the public organisations' sphere, especially when the principle of joint political and economic guidance is observed. These bodies and organisations differ only in their methods of carrying on activities and in their approach to the common cause.

Communist parties hold that a *political* approach must be made to a given question in their work. Lenin said that it is made from the standpoint of millions of people, i.e., from the standpoint of a class. At the present stage of socialist development, this approach is made from the standpoint of the entire society. The Party organisations must solve a given economic, state, industrial or ideological question, or a question concerning cultural life, in the interests of the whole of society, and not in narrow departmental or local interests.

Communist Party guidance is not "domination" by the Party or "dictatorship of the Party", or any other distortion made by opportunist critics of socialist reality.

Roger Garaudy writes that the "internal logic of that system, founded as it was on a view of an apparatus of Party and state that was omniscient and infallible, that spoke and acted in the name of the working class although in fact imposing upon it directives from above, led inevitably to a radical inversion of the Leninist concept of the Party. In what was still called the dictatorship of the proletariat the Party supplanted the class, the apparatus the Party, and finally the leaders took the place of the apparatus."¹

¹ Garaudy, R. *The Turning-Point of Socialism*, Fontana/Collins, London, 1970, p. 97.

The revisionists of today merely echo the slanderous allegations made by the predecessors, particularly the German "Left Communists", who also opposed the "dictatorship of the leaders" to the "dictatorship of the people", and whom Lenin strongly criticised in his "*Left-Wing*" *Communism—an Infantile Disorder*. He explained the correlation between the leaders, the Party, the class and the people under socialism by saying: "The dictatorship is exercised by the proletariat organised in the Soviets; the proletariat is guided by the Communist Party of Bolsheviks.... In its work, the Party relies directly on the *trade unions*.... Then, of course, all the work of the Party is carried on through the Soviets, which embrace the working masses, irrespective of occupation."¹ He then drew the conclusion: "Thus, on the whole, we have a formally non-communist, flexible and relatively wide and very powerful proletarian apparatus, by means of which the Party is closely linked up with the *class* and the *masses*, and by means of which, under the leadership of the Party, the *class dictatorship* is exercised."² Under these conditions, Lenin stressed, one will regard "all this talk about 'from above' or 'from below', about the dictatorship of leaders or the dictatorship of the masses, etc., as ridiculous and childish nonsense".³

The Communist Party carries out its decisions on the strength of inner-Party discipline, which is based on the Communists' conscious implementation of the Party bodies' decisions. Account must be taken of that so as correctly to understand the relations between the Party, the state and public bodies. In short, the main principle of the Party's guidance of economic, state and public organisations is that the Communists who work in non-Party organisations accept the Party guiding instructions and carry them out. The varied forms of Party guidance are based on the experience gained by each Party and the collective experience of the world socialist system.

Many fraternal parties, including the CPSU, establish Party groups at congresses, conferences and meetings held by the Soviets, trade unions, co-operative societies and other working people's organisations. They also establish these

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 49.

² Ibid., p. 48.

³ Ibid., p. 49.

groups in the elective bodies of the said organisations if the bodies have at least three Party members. The groups must increase the Party's influence in every possible way and pursue its policy among non-Party members.

In countries with a multi-party system the Party clubs of deputies, provided for by the standing orders of the higher representative bodies, are a variety of the Party groups. In some countries, the local representative bodies also have such clubs.

The Party's selection, education and placement of cadres are an important component of Party guidance that enable it to influence the major sectors of socialist construction.

The revolution in science and technology and the economic reforms in several socialist countries call for a higher level of political and vocational training.

The 24th CPSU Congress discussed the problem of improving cadre training. The Congress Report said: "Life is continuously making greater demands on cadres. We need people who combine a high level of political consciousness with a sound professional training, people who can knowledgeably tackle the problems of economic and cultural development and are well-versed in modern methods of management."¹

An important question of cadre policy is the simultaneous holding of leading posts in Party, government and public organisations. Individual socialist countries have tackled this question in various ways at different stages of development. Immediately after the Soviet state was established, Lenin emphasised the need to combine the leading posts in the Party and the Soviet executive bodies. But this did not mean that a person necessarily held various leading posts though there were such instances.

Today, the Party and the state interpret this principle as the establishment of close ties between the leading Party and Soviet executive bodies and those of mass organisations. A person does not have to hold two or more leading posts when there are enough highly-skilled cadres.

There are therefore various ways of tackling the given question. Since it is not a constitutional question, it is decided with due regard to practical considerations and the number of persons qualified for administrative work.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 119.

In their guidance, the Party bodies and organisations control the implementation of the Party line in an economic, state or social field. This is effectively expressed, for instance, in the local Party organisations' control over the administrative staff of enterprises, establishments and research institutes. In the socialist countries, the Communist Party Rules provide for this control.

The PUWP Rules say that local Party organisations are accountable to the Party for the enterprises' economic performance.

The Rules of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia state that local Party organisations are to see how the administrative staff of an enterprise or institution carries out the economic tasks set by the Party and the state and how it solves the main problems of their growth without replacing them in their work.

In the Soviet Union, the local organisations of industrial units, research institutes and educational, cultural and medical establishments can now control the administrative staff's work following a decision adopted by the 24th CPSU Congress to amend the Party Rules.

Experience shows that Party control and Party guidance are effective when relations are correctly maintained between the Party bodies and organisations, on the one hand, and state and economic bodies and public organisations, on the other, because Party organisations use the power of authority rather than the authority of power.

In guiding society, the Party bases itself on scientific principles and practical experience, and opposes subjectivism, hasty adoption of decisions and a superficial examination of a question. The Communist Party is fully aware of its historical role, and it does not shrink from responsibility for the adoption of the most revolutionary decisions. The Party proceeds from a correct scientific theory when it studies and takes part in social processes, and tries to understand progressive trends and phenomena even when they are in an embryonic state and stimulates their development, holding itself fully responsible to society for this.

Lenin's principle of collective Party guidance rules out subjectivism and one-sidedness in the adoption of decisions. The Party bodies adopt all important decisions only after consulting Party members, whose support of the leadership's stand gives authority to the decisions and serves as a

pledge of their fulfilment. The Party congress, which is the supreme Party body, determines the Party's long-term policy and controls all the work of elective bodies. The Central Committee and the working executive bodies (commissions) elected by it are collegiate bodies which organise and guide Party activities between congresses.

The Party combines collective leadership with personal responsibility. The 24th CPSU Congress Report says: "While promoting the collegial principle in the leadership we must, at the same time, remember that one of the basic principles of management, as formulated by V. I. Lenin and as our Party understands it, is that 'a definite person is fully responsible for some specified work'.¹

The above-mentioned forms and methods of Party guidance are not hard-and-fast, and they do not apply to all stages of socialist construction. Communist parties in socialist states are seeking new ways and means of pursuing their policy in conformity with both reality and the specific nature of their countries' development.

Party guidance is effective only when it reflects the requirements and social conditions of the time and when it proceeds from scientific principles. The decisions adopted at the Tenth Congress of the RCP(B), held in 1921, said: "The Party of revolutionary Marxism is by no means seeking an absolutely correct form of Party organisation that suits all stages of the revolutionary process and methods of work. On the contrary, the specific historical situation and the problems which arise directly from this situation wholly determine the form of organisation and the methods of work."²

The Communist parties are radically revising the forms and methods of work which do not conform to the new social conditions, and are using new forms and methods.

Co-operation between Party, state and public bodies and organisations, expressed, among other things, in joint examination of important questions and exchange of information on the situation in a particular field, plays an ever greater part in the socialist society's socio-political system as socialist democracy develops widely.

The role of each Communist Party in guiding all social

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 120.

² The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Its Congresses, Conferences and Plenary Meetings of the Central Committee, Part I, p. 516 (in Russian).

processes is steadily and invariably enhanced. The Party's ideological, political and organisational functions continually grow, and it enjoys greater authority among the working people. The Communist Party remains true to Lenin's tenets and continues to be "the teacher, the guide, the leader of all the working people".¹ It will not relinquish this role until it succeeds in leading the people to communism.

3. Mass Organisations

Socialist society's involved, rich and purposeful life cannot develop on the basis of state forms alone. It must be given wider scope, for instance, by establishing various non-state institutions which express the interests of various classes, social groups and individuals. An individual has many interests, and he always seeks to express all the aspects of his character. This cannot be done in an exploiting society, where the individual is alienated and where most of his interests and gifts are suppressed. Marx and Engels said that an individual's development depended on the situation in which he developed. They wrote: "If the circumstances in which the individual lives allow him only the (one)-sided development of a single quality at the expense of all the rest, if they give him the material and time to develop only that one quality, then this individual achieves only a one-sided, crippled development. No moral preaching avails here.... In the case of an individual, for example, whose life embraces a wide circle of varied activities and practical relations to the world, and who, therefore, lives a many-sided life, thought has the same character of universality as every other manifestation of his life."²

Only socialism, putting an end to antagonistic class contradictions and human exploitation, attaches vital importance to an individual's full development and creates all the necessary conditions which enable him to express his interests and inclinations. One such most important condition is the activities carried on by various mass organisations, in which a man can express his personality and satisfy his interests.

When a man takes part in the mass organisations' work, he learns to think like an active public leader responsible for the future of the entire society.

Mass organisations, which are usually established on their members' initiative, can harmoniously combine personal and collective interests and aspirations. But since the entire society is interested in seeing that they carry on their activities, they combine personal and collective interests with public interests. Every mass organisation seeks to meet specific interests in keeping with the general interests that are expressed in the policy pursued by the Party and the state, and to carry out Party and Government decisions with the help of all the organisation's members. Mass organisations are thus a link between the Party and the people and between the state and the people.

Mass organisations *are run by their own members*. They carry on independent activities and realise a qualitatively new democracy in comparison with capitalist democracy. Socialist mass organisations are a form of public self-administration because their internal activities are based on the self-administration principle and, being non-government institutions, they perform many important state functions either together with the state organisations or independently under the control of Party and state bodies. In socialist society, public administration thus develops together with state administration. Public administration is performed by mass organisations, which form a system of *socialist self-administration*.

The working people join in managing public and state affairs by taking an active part in the work of mass organisations, which are schools of public administration and communist education that develop a person intellectually, improve his training and raise his cultural level so as to enable socialist society to advance towards communism.

Mass organisations are of great importance also as regards the socialist state's evolution into communist self-administration. The socialist state cannot outgrow into communist self-administration if the public self-administrative organisations do not increase their activities, since under communism the administration of social life will be on a qualitatively new level. The Communist parties in the socialist countries therefore attach paramount importance to further enhancing the mass organisations' role.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 404.

² Marx, Engels, *The German Ideology*, Moscow, 1968, pp. 290-291.

The Programme of the CPSU says: "As socialist statehood develops, it will gradually become *communist self-government* of the people which will embrace the Soviets, trade unions, co-operatives, and other mass organisations of the people. This process will represent a still greater development of democracy, ensuring the active participation of all members of society in the management of public affairs. Public functions similar to those performed by the state today in the sphere of economic and cultural management will be preserved under communism and will be modified and perfected as society develops. But the character of the functions and the ways in which they are carried out will be different from those under socialism. The bodies in charge of planning, accounting, economic management, and cultural advancement, now government bodies, will lose their political character and will become organs of public self-government."¹ The growth of the mass organisations' role is therefore the result and an important prerequisite of the development of the material and technical basis of communism and of the development of socialist social relations into communist ones.

Mass organisations, as institutions of public self-administration, have their own forms and methods of work. The organisations are managed by their members on the basis of full equality. No one can interfere in their work, impose decisions on them, or determine the composition of the administrative bodies' managing personnel. The organisations adopt rules or statutes to regulate their activities. Unlike government bodies mass organisations make use of persuasion and voluntary subordination of the minority to the majority instead of compulsion and sheer administration. Guidance rests on the leaders' moral prestige and on public opinion. The highest form of punishment meted out to those who do not obey the will of the majority is expulsion from the organisation.

The experience gained by the socialist countries in their socio-political development shows that mass organisations take part in fulfilling state tasks in various ways. For instance, mass organisations and the state co-operate on the basis of equality, mutual assistance and exchange of information on all relevant questions. Mass organisations take an

ever greater part in the establishment of state bodies and in their activities owing to the socialist state's democratic nature and its willingness to co-operate with the public. When state bodies discuss issues that are of interest to mass organisations, the latter take part in the discussion. They also participate in the elaboration of bills and other normative enactments, take the initiative in passing certain acts or carrying out certain measures, and make proposals to the higher legislative bodies. In some socialist countries, they have the power to initiate legislation.

For instance, in recent years, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions has worked out several important draft enactments and submitted them for consideration to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet. They became law after being approved by the Supreme Soviet. The Rules of the Bulgarian Trade Unions state, in line with the Constitution, that the unions shall take part in elaborating state normative acts concerning the working people's life and labour, in executing control of their fulfilment, in drawing up economic plans and in distributing the national income. The new Constitution of the GDR provides that the trade unions shall take part in economic planning and managing and in determining working and living conditions, and that they shall have the power to initiate legislation. The trade unions in other socialist countries enjoy similar rights.

In the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the government and relevant public organisations jointly adopt resolutions. This gives greater authority to the resolutions, and provides for their prompt implementation. In Bulgaria, the BCP Central Committee, the Council of Ministers and the Central Council of Trade Unions jointly adopt normative acts on labour, collective agreements, labour remuneration, and so on.

Mass socio-political organisations (the trade unions, popular fronts, youth organisations, and so on) actively take part in electing the representative bodies of people's power or even holding these elections. They set up electoral commissions, nominate candidates, see to it that universal suffrage is observed, and perform other important functions during elections.

Mass organisations, especially the trade unions, strongly influence the selection and placing of personnel in state

¹ *The Road to Communism*, pp. 555-556.

bodies. In the Soviet Union, the managing personnel must consult a factory trade union committee before appointing an economic administrator.

The Soviet trade unions can take part in setting up bodies to manage catering establishments by giving recommendations to the local bodies which run trade. Mass organisations now enjoy greater rights because they have been given some functions formerly performed by state bodies. The Rules of Soviet Trade Unions say that "functions formerly performed by state bodies are to be increasingly performed by the trade unions as Soviet society advances towards communism".¹

This is theoretically possible and necessary owing to the coherence of socialist society's socio-political system, the absence of contradictions between state and mass organisations, and the profound democratic nature of the social and state system in the socialist countries. The adversaries of socialist democracy ignore this fact, holding that the state "suppresses" all forms of social unification and that mass organisations, which allegedly cannot be independent in a "totalitarian system", are being "governmentalised". But the socialist state helps and supports mass organisations in their activities. For instance, it initially rendered great assistance to the agricultural co-operatives by giving them resources to extend their material basis, develop production and improve the farm workers' well-being.

The transfer of some of the state organisations' functions to mass organisations is especially widely practised in the economy, culture, education, insurance and sport. Here, mass organisations act either independently or jointly with the appropriate state organisations, with which they share their responsibility.

The socialist state does not grow weak and start to "wither away", as some Right-wing revisionists maintain, when some functions are transferred from state organisations to mass organisations, whose role thus increases. The state is not deprived of its functions, for it would be untimely to do so and would only cause harm. First of all, the public takes a greater part in the performance of these functions. Secondly, it is not the state functions, but some functions of state bodies that are transferred to mass or-

¹ *Documents of the 18th Congress of the Trade Unions of the USSR, 1964, p. 123 (in Russian).*

ganisations, which is by no means the same thing. For instance, when an administrative cultural body gives its powers to an appropriate mass organisation, it does not mean that the state "has lost" its cultural and educational function. It continues to perform this function, but by other means and with the help of other, more democratic bodies. Moreover, the state can control the mass organisations' activities, i.e., it continues to be responsible to the people for the situation in all social fields.

Contradictions and conflicts cannot exist between mass organisations and the Communist Party. Mass organisations themselves are interested in maintaining strong ties with the Party and in receiving its approval of their activities so as to preserve their influence among the people. They therefore continually consult Party organisations, send the drafts of major decisions to them and invite their representatives to attend sessions and congresses. They help the Party to study and solve questions that are within their competence, and do everything to carry out its policy. For its part, the Communist Party guides mass organisations, sees to it that their independence and self-administration are observed, and that new members are enrolled, and helps them to play a greater part in solving all important social questions.

In socialist society, mass organisations differing in membership, competence, importance and scale of activities are set up in conformity with the classes and social groups they represent and with the people's interests and inclinations, and background. They include trade unions, cooperative societies, youth organisations, academic, sports and art societies, collectors' clubs, nature conservation associations, societies of friendship with foreign countries, etc., various public bodies, such as committees, councils and commissions, set up by the people on a voluntary basis under the local administrative bodies that deal with the economy, education, public utilities, and so on. The existence of many mass organisations shows that socialist democracy is real. The variety of their forms and their great competence demonstrate that this democracy is on a high level and that it is gradually growing over into communist social self-administration.

Mass organisations with a large membership and whose activities are connected in some way or other with state policy, i.e., political organisations, present particular interest

as regards the democratisation of society. They are socio-political organisations, which constitute a component of the socialist political system, whose core, as we have seen, is the socialist state and whose guiding force is the Communist Party. In the socialist states, the trade unions, youth organisations, co-operative societies and popular (national) fronts are among the most important socio-political organisations. They shall be examined in greater detail.

Trade Unions. Earlier we have dealt with the important role that the trade unions play in the socialist economy and in the working people's participation in the solution of economic problems.¹ But this is not the only work that the trade unions do.

The theory and practice of the trade union movement in socialist society is based on Lenin's rich ideological legacy and the experience gained in applying it in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Owing to historical circumstances, Lenin paid much attention to the trade unions and their role under the dictatorship of the proletariat. He opposed all misinterpretations of the question and strove to turn the trade unions into a real force for building socialism. In socialist society, the trade unions represent, on the one hand, a form of uniting practically the entire working class, which is the ruling class under socialism and the source of political and state power. On the other hand, the trade unions are *mass* and not state, organisations; they are bodies of workers' self-administration which, like all other mass organisations, enjoy a certain independence. This has always given rise to two extreme points of view on the part the trade unions play in the socio-political system.

Right-wing revisionists have denied the historical need for a socialist state, exaggerated the trade unions' role, opposed them to the state machinery and demanded that the state's most important social functions (economic, cultural, educational, etc.) should be given to them. "Left" revisionists, Trotsky in particular, have tried to "governmentalise" the trade unions, "merge" them with the state and introduce military discipline in them. In both cases, the trade unions would have lost their specific nature and their important role, and they would have been disbanded.

Lenin said that the dictatorship of the proletariat could be realised only through the state and the Party. But he also

¹ See page 102 of this book.

stressed, that without such a base as the trade unions the dictatorship could not be realised, nor state functions performed. When he made this high assessment of the part the trade unions played, he held that they essentially linked the workers and all other working people with the state and the Party and that they were an educational organisation, "a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism".¹

Efforts to sever ties between the Party and the trade unions, diminish the class orientation of the latter's activities and relieve them of responsibility for socialist economic development will ultimately undermine the leading role of the working class in society and the socialist nature of their political system. The events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 have borne this out.

In all the socialist countries, the trade unions carry on their activities in conformity with Lenin's propositions on the essence and tasks of the trade unions. The Rules of the Bulgarian Trade Unions say: "Trade unions carry on their activities under the guidance of the Bulgarian Communist Party and rally the factory and office workers round its policy, which is in full keeping with the vital interests of the working class and all other working people."²

In his speech at the 15th Congress of the Soviet Trade Unions, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, Leonid Brezhnev, said that although under socialism the trade union functions extended beyond the simple defence of the workers' interests, the trade unions today as well should protect working people, from what Lenin called excessive administrative zeal and bureaucratic distortions, which still occur to this day. Moreover, "the Soviet trade unions take a direct active part in the development of our society, in boosting production, in increasing its efficiency, in the management of the economy".³

The CPSU Programme says that the Soviet Trade Unions must:

"work constantly to increase the communist conscious-

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 20.

² *The Rules of the Trade Unions of Bulgaria*, Sofia, 1966, pp. 5-6 (in Bulgarian).

³ L. Brezhnev, *Decisions of the 24th CPSU Congress: Militant Programme of the Soviet Trade Unions' Activities*, Moscow, 1972, p. 8 (in Russian).

ness of the masses; organise an emulation movement for communist labour and help the working people in learning to manage state and social affairs; take an active part in controlling the measure of labour and the measure of consumption;

"encourage the activity of factory and office workers, enlisting their aid in the work for continuous technical progress, for higher productivity of labour, for the fulfilment and overfulfilment of state plans and assignments;

"work steadfastly for the improvement of the skill of factory and office workers and their working and living conditions; protect the material interests and rights of the working people;

"ensure that housing and cultural development plans are fulfilled and that public catering, trade, social insurance, and health resort services are improved;

"ensure control over the spending of public consumption funds and over the work of all enterprises and institutions servicing the people;

"improve cultural services and recreation facilities for the working people; encourage physical training and sports."¹

The trade unions therefore continue to be essentially a school of administration, a school of economic management. The 24th Party Congress Report said: "The Party will continue giving constant support to the trade unions as the largest organisations of the working people and seeing to it that they are able to fulfil their role of school of administration, school of economic management and school of communism more fully and successfully."² It was emphasised at the Congress that the trade unions were taking part in carrying out many economic tasks, including the elaboration of state plans, the management of an enterprise and the drawing of the working people into the management of state and social affairs.

The Communist parties in other socialist countries also stress that the trade unions are playing a greater part today. The Polish United Workers' Party says that the trade unions, which carry on their activities in keeping with the principle of unity and interdependence of production problems and the

working people's everyday living conditions, must especially see to it that the working conditions are systematically improved and that the cultural and everyday requirements are satisfied. The trade unions see to it that bonuses are correctly distributed at the enterprises and that social tasks are carried out. At the Eighth SUPG Congress, the Party Central Committee proposed that the GDR trade unions should attach special attention to socialist emulation, and that they should not allow the improvement of the working people's living and working conditions to be treated as something unimportant. In his Report at the Congress, Erich Honecker stressed that this would be in keeping with the social mission of the trade unions, which express the working people's interests.

The trade unions play an increasing part in the management of state and social affairs in full conformity with Lenin's teaching on these mass organisations of the ruling class.

The Soviet socialist state and the Communist Party are taking important measures to enhance the role of the trade unions and to give them greater competence. In the 1930s, the People's Commissariat for Labour was disbanded after its functions were given to the Soviet trade unions. In many socialist countries, sanatoria, health resorts and holiday homes have recently been put under the jurisdiction of trade unions. In 1960, the Bulgarian trade unions were given social insurance functions formerly performed by the Ministry of Health and Social Security. The trade unions in most socialist countries also perform these functions today. They now enjoy greater rights in economic planning and management, protecting the working people's interests, regulating working conditions and controlling labour legislation, and the working people's education. At the 15th Congress of the Soviet Trade Unions, Leonid Brezhnev said that, "in their educational work, the trade unions must above all form the working people's socialist and communist attitude towards labour and public property."¹ They also take part in maintaining law and order, helping the courts and establishing public control over the state bodies' activities.

¹ *The Road to Communism*, pp. 553-554.

² 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 95-96.

¹ L. Brezhnev, *Decisions of the 24th CPSU Congress: Militant Programme of the Soviet Trade Unions' Activities*, p. 10 (in Russian).

Lenin said that the trade unions, which formally remain independent organisations, can and must "take an active part in the work of the Soviet government by directly working in all government bodies, by organising mass control over their activities, etc., and by setting up new bodies for the registration, control and regulation of all production and distribution, relying on the organised initiative of the broad mass of the interested working people themselves".¹

The trade unions are teaching the workers and other working people how to manage efficiently, and are drawing them into management thus enabling them to take part in deciding state and social problems.

That is an important trend of the development of socialist trade unions, fully conforming to the objective process of the socialist state's evolution into communist public self-administration.

Youth Organisations. Socialist society is interested in educating the younger generation properly, for they will continue the profound changes started by the older generations, which carried out the revolution. The CPSU and the Soviet state must pass on to the young people their fathers' ideals and values and teach them to manage society competently.

The young people in the socialist countries are politically conscious and selfless in their labour. They know that personal interests are indissolubly connected with public interests, and they are willing to apply their knowledge and abilities in society's interests. They take an active part in socio-political life, and try to gain a sound knowledge of technology and the social sciences, especially Marxism-Leninism.

Socialist reality refutes bourgeois and revisionist allegations that "great ideological differences" exist between young people and the older generation. The social forces have always been delineated on a class basis, and never on the basis of age. There are no antagonistic contradictions and ideological conflicts under socialism, which is a society of friendly classes. The unimportant contradictions that might exist in views between parents and children are the result of the dissimilar perception of reality, owing to the difference in age, and can be easily overcome by willingness to understand one another. In socialist society, the relations between generations are based on co-operation, mutual assistance

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 421.

and the continuity of ideas, values, morality and traditions.

The older generation has enabled young people to be free from exploitation, to develop their personality in every possible way, freely to choose a field of endeavour and acquire rich knowledge. The young people can join socio-political organisations and set up their own associations. In youth organisations, the young people satisfy their specific interests, which are determined by their age and occupation. These organisations carry on their activities in keeping with the public interests. For instance, the young people take part in socialist and communist construction, educate the rising generation and acquire greater knowledge. Youth organisations (such as student, athletic and academic) and youth bodies (such as student councils and young specialists' councils) are set up in keeping with the common interests of groups of young people. The Young Communist Leagues, initially set up as the young workers' political associations, are important youth organisations. Their many members carry on socio-political activities.

The Young Communist League was the first organisational and political form of the young workers' unity in Russia. It has served the revolutionary cause ever since its foundation. During the trying years when the Soviet state was being established, it rallied the young people round the Party on the basis of the Party's platform and its guidance.

Lenin, whose name is now enshrined in the Young Communist League in the Soviet Union, set its members and all conscientious young people the historic task of becoming active builders of the new society and the Party's assistants at all the sectors of the struggle for socialism. But the young people first had to study and acquire knowledge. The YCL has done an enormous amount of work in training and educating young people, providing them with work, protecting their labour and enlisting their efforts in carrying out the tasks set by the Party.

Young Communist Leagues, or communist youth organisations that correspond to them (the Free German Youth in the GDR, for instance), have been set up in all the socialist countries. They are the largest, most active and authoritative youth organisations. The All-Union Leninist Young Communist League has over 28 million members,¹

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 96.

and the Free German Youth has over two million members. This enormous army of young people takes an active part in social life and in carrying out the tasks of socialist construction. The YCL rallies the young people round the Party, both ideologically and organisationally, and links the Party with all young people.

The Rules of the Leninist Young Communist League of the Soviet Union say that the Komsomol is an independent mass organisation to which the broad sections of the young progressive Soviet people belong, that it is an active assistant and reserve of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and that it helps the Party to educate young people in the spirit of communism, draw them into construction of the new society, and train a generation which is comprehensively developed. It also guides the Leninist Young Pioneer Organisation to which most of the country's children between 7 and 14 belong.

Like other mass organisations, the Komsomol works under the leadership of the CPSU. Its Rules say: "The Komsomol's strength lies in the leadership effected by the CPSU, in its ideological staunchness and fidelity to the Party cause. From the Party it learns to live, work, struggle and triumph in the Leninist way." In his report to the Tenth Congress of the BCP, Todor Zhivkov said that it was correct to give the Dimitrov Young Communist League (which has over a million members) a greater part to play as the vanguard of the young generation, the Party's prime assistant and reserve, and its strong supporter in socialist construction. The YCL of Bulgaria is the main organiser of the young people's technical and scientific activities, their military and technical training, and their patriotic and internationalist education.

The Soviet Komsomol, which is progressive Soviet youth's self-administrative organisation, functions on Lenin's principles of collective guidance, all-round development of democracy in the League, its members' initiative and creative activities, and criticism and self-criticism.

In the socialist countries, the YCL organisations take an active part in socio-political life and in the management of state and social affairs. In some countries, the higher YCL bodies can make proposals for improving the young people's work, education and life directly to the Party, state and other bodies. For instance, the Komsomol Central Com-

mittee, together with the USSR Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of Higher and Specialised Secondary Education and the State Committee for Science and Technology, adopted the resolution "On the Work with Young Researchers", in conformity with which a Young Researchers' Council was set up under the Komsomol so as to co-ordinate their work.

The YCL organisations take part in establishing state bodies, in which they have their deputies. They also co-operate with the local administrative bodies in tackling all important questions concerning young people.

Over half a million young people are now deputies to the Soviets; young people account for about 20 per cent of the deputies to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The 24th CPSU Congress Report said: "Party organisations have begun to show more determination in assigning responsible sectors of work to Komsomol members. The Komsomol is now more active socio-politically.... Our duty is to pass on to the rising generation our political experience and our experience in resolving problems of economic and cultural development, to direct the ideological upbringing of young people and to do everything to enable them to be worthy continuers of the cause of their fathers, of the cause of the great Lenin."¹

Co-operatives. Under socialism, the co-operative system is an important factor of socialist change. The founders of Marxism-Leninism had emphasised this fact. Engels wrote: "We must widely use co-operative production as an intermediate stage when making the transition to a full communist economy. Marx and I have never doubted it."²

Co-operative enterprises were considerably developed already under capitalism. But it was erroneously held that capitalism could grow into socialism through the co-operative. Time and again Marx stressed that the essence of the co-operative and the part it played in society depended on the nature of the social system, and that at best the co-operative could somewhat ease human exploitation, but it could not transform capitalist society. At the same time, Marx, and later Lenin, asserted that since political power

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 96, 97.

² Marx/Engels, *Werke*, Bd. 36, S. 426.

was in the hands of the working class, since that political power owned all the means of production, the co-operative would become an important means of building socialism for it contained elements of the collective socialist economy. But it could play this part only when it carried on its activities in society's interests and when its interests conformed to those of the socialist state.

Lenin exposed the opportunists' demand that the co-operatives should be independent of the state and society. He also showed the harmfulness of the conceptions advanced by the Trotskyites, who misinterpreted the co-operatives' role, in particular their role in transforming the countryside on socialist lines, and who called for their elimination by merger with state bodies, and for the confiscation of co-operative property. This could have undermined the workers' alliance with the peasants and done harm to the socialist cause. Lenin said that co-operative property under socialism was a form of socialist property, and that it constituted the economic basis of socialism together with public (state) property.

Lenin attached great importance to peasant co-operatives. He said, on the basis of a profound scientific analysis, that only the co-operative system could lead small-scale farms to socialism. The co-operatives combined the personal interests of the peasants and those of society in the best possible way; being based on joint property and labour, they established socialist production relations in the countryside and made it possible to use planning and other principles of socialist management. The producer co-operative, i.e., the collective farm in the Soviet Union, is the highest form of co-operation in the countryside.

The implementation by the Party of Lenin's programme under which the peasantry made the change-over to collective farming entailed a revolution in economic relations and brought about a radical solution of the peasant question. The collective-farm system became a component of Soviet socialist society. Owing to the collective farmers' selfless labour and to the efforts of the workers, of the entire Soviet people, the social wealth of the collective farms (which are now large mechanised agricultural enterprises) has immeasurably increased, the collective farmers' living standards have risen and the differences between the town and countryside are being overcome.

The socialist agricultural co-operative is: (1) "a voluntary peasants' organisation set up jointly to manage large-scale socialist agricultural production on the basis of collectively owned means of production and collective labour",¹ (2) a form of the peasants' self-administration and a means of drawing them into social life. The Model Rules say that the collective farm is a school of communism for farmers.

The second aspect of the agricultural co-operative—working peasants' public self-administrative organisation—must be dealt with at greater length.

Co-operatives are economically independent, because they enjoy broad rights in their economic management. The state bodies cannot interfere in the co-operatives' internal affairs and cannot dispose of their property. The local and central bodies guide the agricultural co-operative mainly by planning, regulating and controlling their activities and by rendering them all possible assistance. The state thus guides the co-operatives in keeping with the democracy they enjoy.

The self-administration of the co-operatives develops on the basis of their economic independence. The Model Rules of the Agricultural Co-operative Farms of Bulgaria say: "The agricultural co-operative farm is managed on the basis of democracy enjoyed in the co-operative societies. The general meeting is the supreme body and the absolute master of the co-operative farm."²

The general meeting of the members of a co-operative enjoys broad powers which cover all aspects of the society's life. For instance, it adopts and amends the Rules, elects the board, the collective-farm chairman and an auditing committee, admits and expels members, adopts collective-farm regulations and provisions on pay and on self-supporting principles, approves the collective farm's long-term and annual financial and production plans, annual reports and the size of monetary funds and the funds for payment in kind, and settles matters concerning amalgamation or division, changes in size, and entry into state, collective-farm and inter-collective-farm enterprises and organisations or into associations and unions.

Every member of the socialist agricultural co-operative

¹ *The Model Rules of the Collective Farm*, Moscow, 1970, p. 4 (in Russian).

² *Rules of the Agricultural Co-operative Farms of the European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1966, p. 25 (in Russian).

has a say in all decision-making. In the GDR, for instance, every member of the agricultural producer co-operative shall attend general meetings, express his views on all aspects of the co-operative's life and make proposals. At the general meeting, he can elect persons to various commissions and be elected himself, and he can ask the leading bodies and the functionaries of an agricultural producer co-operative to give an account of its affairs. Moreover, he can, and even must, take part in managing the co-operative's affairs.

The rights of co-operative members to manage their own affairs are not confined to the framework of one co-operative, but apply to the entire co-operative system. Thus, the new GDR Constitution enables the agricultural producer co-operatives to take an active part in state planning and the management of social development through their organisations and their representatives in the legislative and executive bodies of the state. The members of a co-operative take part in state administration also through their farm's representation in the district and republican councils of agriculture and foodstuffs. GDR peasants also participate in the elaboration of the agrarian policy, and regularly hold local and nation-wide congresses.

In the Soviet Union, Collective Farms' Councils have been set up in the centre, in districts, regions, territories and republics on the basis of the decision adopted at the Third All-Union Congress of Collective Farmers. The councils are the collective farmers' elected bodies which, together with the state agricultural bodies, manage collective-farm affairs. Most members of the Councils are collective farmers, and the rest are representatives of state bodies. The collective farmers account for 75 per cent of the members of the Collective Farms' Central Council. These councils play a big part in developing the self-administration of collective farms and raising agricultural output. The Councils are to perform an increasing number of functions, gradually becoming the main bodies of collective-farm management.

Apart from the agricultural producer co-operatives, the socialist countries have handicraft, fishery, horticultural and other co-operative associations. There are also consumer societies, which have over 60 million shareholders in the USSR, and which help the farmers by providing them with goods,

purchasing agricultural produce from co-operative members as well as in raising the material and cultural level in the countryside. In the consumer and all other co-operative societies, the management of internal affairs is based on the same principles as the management of agricultural co-operatives.

Popular Fronts. All the components of socialist society have a common nature and are interlinked. All classes and social groups co-operate with one another in socialist society, which has no antagonistic class and other irreconcilable contradictions. Socialist society is politically based on an indissoluble alliance of two friendly classes, i.e., the workers and the peasants; all other sections of the working people rally round these classes. The working people are therefore all united, both morally and politically.

In the Soviet Union, the people's ideological and political unity is expressed in the bloc of the Communists and non-Party people. In other socialist countries, the popular alliance has been embodied in special mass socio-political organisations, i.e., popular (national, fatherland and united) fronts, as a result of the specific features of the revolution. The 1968 GDR Constitution provides that the parties and mass organisations in the National Front of Democratic Germany shall unite all the people's forces so as to take concerted action for developing socialist society. They thus realise co-operation between all people in socialist society, on the basis of the principle that "everyone is responsible for the common cause". The popular fronts (the Fatherland Popular Front in Hungary, the Fatherland Front in Bulgaria, the National Front in the GDR, the National Unity Front in Poland, the Fatherland Front in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Socialist Unity Front in Rumania, the National Front in Czechoslovakia and the Socialist Alliance of Working People in Yugoslavia) are thus an organisational and political form of the workers' alliance with other sections of the working people.

Although these socio-political organisations and movements differ in organisational structure and in the forms and methods of their activities, they all have important features in common. To begin with, they all have the same historical roots. The Seventh Congress of the Communist International developed Lenin's views on broad class alliances and called for the unification of the peasants, the

urban petty bourgeoisie and the working people of the oppressed nationalities under the workers' guidance and for the establishment of a broad anti-fascist Popular Front on this basis. Georgi Dimitrov showed the essence of this slogan, emphasising: "The revolutionary proletariat's decisive action in defence of the demands made by these sections, particularly the toiling peasantry, plays a vital part in establishing an anti-fascist popular front. The demands are in keeping with the proletariat's vital interests when the workers' demands are combined with such demands in the course of struggle."¹

Such mass socio-political organisations and movements as the Popular (National) Fronts were set up during the anti-fascist, national liberation struggle which developed into a revolution, resulting in the establishment of a people's democratic system. The Communist (Workers') parties have always been their organisers and leaders. The Communists guided the Popular Front in its policy, which played an important role in uniting the broad sections of the population on the basis of the programme demands made as revolution unfolded, and in the exposure and isolation of the anti-revolutionary bourgeois forces. Mass socio-political organisations and movements played an important part in the establishment of people's power. The Popular Fronts assumed the features of socialist organisations as the dictatorship of the proletariat was consolidated, and they mustered the broad sections of the working people with a view to carrying out the tasks of socialist construction advanced by the Communist parties.

After the socialist revolutions, the Popular Fronts (which continued to be a link between the Party and the working people) were bent on the all-round development of socialist society, improved its socio-political system and drew the working people into the management of state and social affairs. Time has refuted the arguments of those who maintained that these organisations and movements, which played an important part in the socialist revolution, would lose their importance under the new historical conditions. At the Plenary Meeting of the CC BCP in July 1968, Todor Zhivkov said that the Fatherland Front had not lost any of its im-

¹ G. Dimitrov, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1957, p. 402 (in Russian).

portance: "As a national socio-political organisation, it has not completed its mission yet."¹

The events in Czechoslovakia in 1968 have shown that the Right-wing opportunist, revisionist and nationalist elements are trying to discredit the Marxist-Leninist concept of the importance of such organisations and movements as the National Front and the principle of their guidance by the Marxist-Leninist parties. The outspoken anti-socialist ideologists were against the idea of keeping the National Front in society's political system, holding that it hampered the "free play of political forces" and the re-establishment of the bourgeois democratic system which had existed before the Munich Agreement. Other representatives of "democratic socialism" hoped to use the National Front for their ends, maintaining that it should be turned into a "pluralist centre for the establishment of a political line".² They tried to make the National Front an organisation which had existed prior to February 1948. In short, they wanted to reduce it to a coalition of political parties which did not recognise CPCz leadership.

The Czechoslovak working people, led by the CPCz, have exposed and foiled the Right-wing anti-socialist forces in their efforts to undermine the National Front which, with the help of the CPCz, re-established and consolidated itself as a class alliance between the workers, the co-operative peasants, the socialist intelligentsia, and other sections of the working people and their organisations. The CPCz is trying to draw more and more working people into the management of social affairs through the National Front, which unites the Czechs, the Slovaks and other nationalities in the republic. In his Report to the 14th CPCz Congress, Gustav Husák said: "The National Front will keep its function in our political system, and its organisations will lead millions of working people in consolidating socialist patriotism, proletarian internationalism, fraternal relations between our peoples and nationalities, and the unity and strength of our state."³

Today the Popular Fronts embrace broad sections of the

¹ T. Zhivkov, *Main Directions in the Development of Administration of Our Society*, Sofia, 1968, p. 100 (in Bulgarian).

² See B. N. Topornin, "Socialism and a Multi-party System" in *Soviet State and Law*, No. 5, 1971, p. 109 (in Russian).

³ *Rudé právo*, May 26, 1971.

population and express the policy of unity between the workers and all working people, and between Communists and non-Communists. Some countries have unions with their own Rules and a network of organisations in the localities (the Fatherland Front in Bulgaria, for instance), and others have movements with no Rules, clearly-defined organisational forms, membership, and so on (the National Front in the GDR, for instance). But the Fronts essentially resemble one another in that they have their own bodies and programme aims, and use similar methods. They may be regarded as both associations which include mass organisations, and as mass movements which have a very broad representation of various classes, social sections and all working people in general.

The Fronts have adopted the communist programme for building a developed socialist society. In its pre-election address to the voters in the republic in 1967, the National Council of the National Front of Democratic Germany (GDR) said: "We are now about to enter a new stage of socialist construction, that is, the establishment of a developed socialist social system in the German Democratic Republic. This great prospect has been held out to us by the Seventh Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. The parties and organisations belonging to the National Front, and all public forces, have accepted it as their own prospect and have made it the substance of their work." This is the stand taken by the Fronts in all the fraternal socialist countries.

The National Fronts also determine their own tasks concerning foreign policy, state construction, and economic and cultural development in the localities and the country as a whole. The ideological aspect of their work is of especial importance today. It is connected with the Marxist-Leninist education and re-education of the members of society and the struggle against anti-communism, anti-Sovietism, nationalism and Right and "Left" opportunism.

The Front's central and local bodies have representatives from the most important public organisations and movements, including all the political parties in countries with a multi-party system. The bodies settle all questions by carefully discussing them and taking account of the views of every organisation. They adopt a decision only when an understanding is reached, and not by a majority vote. Today, the Fronts

are united in their activities owing not to someone's diktat, but to their common tasks and common class nature, and to enormous painstaking preliminary work.

The Fronts become more embracive. They include trade unions, youth leagues, women's organisations, peace movements, sports associations and co-operative societies. In Rumania, national-territorial associations have recently joined the Socialist Unity Front. In Bulgaria, the National Peace Committee, the Slav Committee, and several other committees have joined the Fatherland Front, but they have kept their organisational independence. The fact that new organisations are joining the Fronts shows that the working people are taking a more active part in socio-political affairs and that socialist democracy is developing.

The Popular Fronts also take a greater part in the work of representative and executive state bodies on the basis of both their representation in state bodies and cooperation in deciding the urgent problems facing society. Their participation in the establishment of state bodies and in these bodies' activities is an effective means of drawing the working people into administration and of democratising state and social life. The Rules of the Patriotic People's Front of Hungary say: "The Patriotic People's Front, the broadest mass political movement of the Hungarian working people, must carry out important tasks in establishing state bodies, proposing candidates for deputies and holding elections. It assists the deputies to the State Assembly and the members of the Councils in their work, sees to it that they have the necessary facilities for reporting to their electors and for receiving them, supports the state bodies' activities and lends a hand in consolidating their mass basis and intensifying their influence on the people. The bodies of the Patriotic People's Front maintain direct ties with the Party, state and public bodies that function on the appropriate territory."¹

In the socialist countries which have a Popular (National) Front, the deputies to the representative bodies are nominated by socio-political organisations only in agreement with the Front and by the Front itself. In either case, the candidates are nominated on behalf of the Front. The Popular Front's

¹ L. S. Yagodovsky, *Popular Fronts in the European Socialist Countries*, Moscow, 1968, p. 121 (in Russian).

bodies organise and direct pre-election campaigns, see to it that elections are carried out properly, and draw a large number of their members into this work.

The Popular Fronts exert a strong influence on the composition and work of legislative and other state bodies. The Front's bodies organise nation-wide discussions of urgent social problems and draft legislation, and analyse and summarise the views and proposals of various organisations and groups of working people. The bodies work out their own views and proposals and inform the state bodies of them. The latter must carefully study these and take them into account. It is the custom (in most cases fixed in law) with the Popular Front's bodies directly to take part in matters discussed by the local representative and executive bodies. The latter put the issues advanced by the Front's bodies on the agenda of their sessions. In some cases, the state bodies and the Popular Front's bodies can jointly hold sessions in the localities and at the highest level. The Popular Front exercises public control over the activities of representative and other state bodies by implementing its right to recall deputies.

The Popular Fronts draw the broad sections of the working people into socio-political activities, carry out political and cultural work among them, teach them how to manage society, and act as organisations for public self-administration. The Communist parties in the socialist countries therefore emphasise the need to develop their activities and give them a greater part to play in the socialist socio-political system. This trend is reflected in the new constitutions of the socialist countries. The 1971 Bulgarian Constitution says: "The Fatherland Front is the embodiment of the alliance between the workers, toiling peasants and the national intelligentsia. It is a public support of people's power, a school that gives the masses of people a patriotic communist education and a means of enabling the working people to administer the country."

* * *

The Communist Party, therefore, does not prevent mass socio-political organisations from carrying on their activities and does not encroach upon their independence when it guides society. On the contrary, the trade unions, the Popular Fronts, youth, co-operative and other organisations

play a greater part at the present stage of socialist construction. This is a manifestation of the objectively developing democratisation process affecting the social and state system. Socialist reality and the activities carried on by the Communist parties, which guide and stimulate this process, refute the charges of "etatism" and "monopolism" advanced by the critics of socialist democracy, and show that the ideas of genuine democracy have triumphed in the Soviet Union and other socialist states, which are guided by Marxist-Leninist doctrine on socialist and communist construction.

4. Socialism and the Multi-Party System

The Communists do not deny that when the Communist Party plays the leading role in socialist society, other parties representing classes and social sections that are friendly to the workers can exist in the political system.

The multi-party and one-party systems do not depend on a dogmatic scheme; they result from specific conditions under which the transition from capitalism to socialism is made and a developed socialism is built. In countries where the multi-party system has proved to be necessary, it consolidates the alliance between the workers, peasants, intelligentsia and other non-proletarian sections of the population, and rallies the people round the guiding force of society, the Communist (Workers') party.

Some socialist countries only have the Communist Party, while other socialist countries that emerged after the Second World War (Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the DRV, the GDR, the KPDR and Poland) have also democratic non-proletarian parties.

The multi-party system under socialism has long been a pet subject for bourgeois and revisionist "researchers". They often take the number of political parties as a criterion for determining whether a society is democratic or not, and hold that since the socialist state is a "totalitarian" system, it must logically have only one party.

Francis Kase, the author of *People's Democracy* (put out in Leyden, Holland, in 1968), says that the multi-party system "is something which is hard to reconcile with the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism", which under socialism allegedly recognises only one party, the workers'

party. Since he cannot deny the fact that other political parties exist in socialist countries, he attributes this fact to the "propagandistic value" of the multi-party system.¹ This is the stand essentially taken by Robert Conquest, the British Sovietologist who has written that the Bolsheviks forcibly eliminated even the parties and political groupings which the workers supported. They included the Mensheviks, the Workers' Opposition and the "great workers" movement which culminated in the Kronstadt Rebellion".²

Many opportunist ideologists also call for the establishment of a party that would be in opposition to the Communists, holding that this is a way of "democratising" socialism.

The Right ideologists, who strongly opposed the socialist system in Czechoslovakia in 1968, held that political life was "normal" when the morality and traditions of bourgeois social pluralism prevailed and when the non-proletarian parties were the antipode of the Communist Party. At the time, even the Communists' union with the Social Democrats in the CPCz was declared "illegal".

Before showing the reasons why the socialist countries vary in their number of parties, it should be noted that Marxists-Leninists regard political parties not as an isolated issue, but as a component of a more general and important question concerning the strategy and tactics of both the workers' class alliances and the consolidation of the people's political and ideological unity under Communist guidance. Lenin said that "without an alliance with non-Communists in the most diverse spheres of activity there can be no question of any successful communist construction".³ Historical experience shows that the establishment and consolidation of this alliance is a general law of society's transition from capitalism to socialism.

This does not mean, however, that Marxists-Leninists belittle the multi-party system's importance or try to dissolve this problem in a more general question. The conditions in which the revolution developed and socialism was built differed from country to country, and therefore the political system of the new society was not shaped in the same

¹ F. Kase, *People's Democracy*, Leyden, 1968, p. 136.

² *The Soviet Political System*, Edited by Robert Conquest, London, 1968, p. 8.

³ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 227.

way. In some countries, the question of the multi-party system was insignificant in the struggle for socialism, and in others it was of great importance and the Communists had to devote a great deal of attention to it. This is true not only of the countries with a multi-party system, but of many countries with one party.

The specific nature of the emergence and development of the socialist political system naturally left an imprint on the factors that gave rise to either a multi-party or one-party system. These factors did not always play the same part in the socio-political life of each socialist state. Since they were closely intertwined, attachment of excessive importance to, or disregard of, one or several factors would have only distorted the general shape of events, giving rise to incorrect conclusions. This is essential for analysing even the first factor that we are to examine, i.e., *social heterogeneity* which characterises the socialist countries (though not to an equal extent) not only in the period of emergence of the new social system, but also in conditions of developed socialism and its growth into communism.

In the socialist states, social heterogeneity basically differs from the class antagonisms inherent in capitalist society. Socialist society has no place for the big bourgeoisie and landowners, who were expropriated during the first revolutionary changes wrought by people's power. The kulaks are also gradually expropriated in the course of socialist transformations.

In the main, socialist society consists of two friendly classes, i.e., the workers and the co-operative peasants, and the intelligentsia. In Bulgaria, the factory, office and other workers account for 59.2 per cent of the population, the co-operative peasants and handicraftsmen—39.2 per cent, and other sections—1.6 per cent; in the GDR, the factory, office and other workers account for 82.7 per cent of the population, the co-operative peasants and handicraftsmen—13.5 per cent, and other sections—3.8 per cent; in the Soviet Union, which is now successfully building communism, the factory, office and other workers account for 77.7 per cent of the population, collective farmers—22.27 per cent, and other sections—0.03 per cent.¹

¹ "Political Structure of Socialist States". Supplement to *World Marxist Review*, 1970, No. 8, p. 7.

Socialist society therefore has no irreconcilable social contradictions which under capitalism result in the establishment of political parties and in an intense struggle between them. These contradictions do not exist even in the socialist states which have a somewhat specific class structure. At a certain stage there existed a part of the middle bourgeoisie in the GDR (who in the main were owners of medium-sized capitalist enterprises). The socialist GDR, however, had taken account of its specific conditions and carried out measures to enlist these sections of the population in the development of the socialist social system. In Poland (where the co-operative peasants account for only 3.5 per cent of the population), about 50 per cent of the farms belong to "farming groups", which are the initial forms of agricultural co-operatives and which now exist in 87 per cent of the villages.

The interests and requirements of particular sections of the working population do not disappear with the elimination of the socio-economic basis that gives rise to class antagonisms. Specific interests and requirements resulting from the different role in material production and dissimilar spiritual interests long remain in the socialist countries even when the basic interests, i.e., aspiration for successful socialist construction, are the same. At times, these requirements give rise to non-proletarian democratic parties, including peasant parties (such as the Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union, the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany and the United Peasant Party of Poland), which represent the interests of many peasants and other persons who are either engaged in, or closely connected with, agriculture. Although peasants' parties carry on activities mainly in the countryside, some of them have their organisations in towns as well. The role of these parties in the political system greatly changed after the establishment of people's power owing to changes in the countryside and in the peasants' way of thinking. At the initial stages of socialist construction, they concentrated their attention on agrarian reforms and on ways to consolidate and develop revolutionary gains. Today, they are helping to complete socialist construction (Poland) and build fully developed socialism (Bulgaria and the GDR).

But the peasants' parties, whose membership greatly differs in relative and absolute terms, are not the peasants' sole political organisations. They represent only a part of the peasantry. The Bulgarian Agrarian People's Union (BAPU)

now has 120,000 members, the United Peasants' Party (Poland) has 400,000 members, and so on. The most active and conscientious representatives of the peasantry and the rural intelligentsia are members of the Marxist-Leninist parties: the peasants account for 29.8 per cent of the membership of the Bulgarian Communist Party (672,000 members), 5.8 per cent of the membership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (over 1.8 million members) and 11.4 per cent of the membership of the Polish United Workers' Party (2.2 million members). The Communist (Workers') parties have a network of local and territorial organisations in the countryside.

In some socialist countries, specific interests have been preserved by several urban sections, including handicraftsmen, tradesmen, intellectuals of the pre-revolutionary period and a part of the workers engaged at small enterprises. These sections form the social base of such parties as the Democratic Party (Poland), the Liberal Democratic Party (GDR), the Czechoslovak Socialist Party (formerly, the National Socialist Party) and the Slovak National Revival Party (Czechoslovakia). These parties are naturally smaller than the peasants' parties, which fact reflects the correlation of classes and sections in society. The parties which represent the "middle" urban and partly rural sections continue the best traditions of the liberal democratic movements that existed in pre-revolutionary society and enable the groups that are looking for suitable forms of participation in socialist construction to adopt a socialist platform.

This is especially true of people with religious views. In some socialist countries, the church directly or indirectly supports political parties which have believers as their members (the Christian Democratic Union in the GDR and the People's Party in Czechoslovakia). These parties enable religious people to take an active part in carrying out economic, political and ideological tasks with a view to building and developing socialism.

Under socialism, political parties can be set up or preserved owing to other causes. The National Democratic Party of Germany (GDR), which has a large part of the middle urban sections in its ranks, was originally set up to draw various sections of the population into the reconstruction of Germany, including people strongly influenced by nazi ideology, former soldiers and officers, former public servants, and rank-and-file members who belonged to the nazi party.

The NDPG helped these people to rid themselves of the grim legacy of the past, gradually take a socialist stand and play a definite part in the construction of the people's state.

The socialist society has no place for parties which defend and express the interests of the landowners and big bourgeoisie. There is no reason why these parties should be kept after the proletarian revolution and the subsequent transformation of the social system. Historical experience shows that the revolutionary gains cannot be consolidated and developed without exposing Right-wing parties, both politically and ideologically, and defeating them organisationally. Such Russian parties as the Octobrists (Union of October 17), the Constitutional Democrats, the Progressive Party, and so on, which were anti-popular even before the October Socialist Revolution in 1917, began to organise whiteguard uprisings, instigated civil war and encouraged foreign intervention immediately after the establishment of Soviet power.

In other countries, the development of the revolutionary process also called for the disbandment of the extreme Right-wing parties. In Czechoslovakia, the avowed fascist and pro-fascist parties (the National Socialist Party, the Sudeten-German Party and Vlajka—the Czech fascists' party) and the ruling parties (the Agrarian Party and the Handicraftsmen Party), which existed before the Munich Agreement was signed and which were responsible for the occupation and the partition of the country, were banned even before the Košice Government adopted its programme in April 1945. In Hungary, the people's revolution immediately did away with the fascist party, and in Germany the Control Council banned the nazi party.

Historical traditions brought into being by the multi-party system before and after the establishment of people's power affect the number of political parties that exist in a socialist country. The traditions are expressed, for instance, in the practice of certain sections of the population to realise their social interests by setting up their "own" political parties, establishing constant ties with one of their "own" parties, giving preference to their "own" party press, and taking part in political life, including elections, discussions and various campaigns, under the guidance of their "own" party. They are naturally progressive traditions which grad-

ually acquired a new, socialist content. Time has shattered the illusions spread by the champions of bourgeois democracy.

Many non-proletarian democratic political parties that now exist in the socialist countries were set up at the turn of the century. They include the BAPU, which celebrated its 70th anniversary in 1970. The Czechoslovak Socialist Party which was set up as early as 1897, and the Czechoslovak People's Party, established in 1918. The latter is actually the continuer of three parties set up at the end of last century: the Czech Christian Social Party, the Catholic National Party and the reformist Christian Social Party. In Poland, the peasants' movement emerged before the Second World War. The Democratic Party, which is younger than other parties, was set up there in 1939 on the basis of the urban intellectual progressives. The Liberal Democratic Party of Germany, founded in 1945, is mainly the continuer of the German People's Party and the German Democratic Party which existed until 1933. The Christian Democratic Union of Germany was set up in 1945 on the basis of the political groups which once formed the Centre Party and the Liberal Party.

The socialist multi-party system has not been a take-over from the past. A few parties were able to make the "transition" from one social system to the other. Many others were set up after the war. A very important fact is that radical changes were made in the essence of the multi-party system as a whole, and in the programme provisions and specific activities of individual political parties. But the continuity of the progressive and revolutionary traditions undoubtedly influenced the political system of the new society. Understandably, the multi-party system exists mainly in countries where it had existed before the revolution (Czechoslovakia, Poland and Bulgaria).

But why do these traditions exert an influence? For many people the multi-party system has always been connected with periods of the highest development of bourgeois democracy. The establishment of fascist or reactionary rule either limited or did away with the freedom of activity not only for Communist and Workers' parties, but also for many bourgeois parties. When the fascists seized power in Germany, they put an end to the multi-party system which had existed in the Weimar Republic. In Czechoslovakia, a number of

bourgeois parties ceased to exist and the arch-reactionary National Unity Party was set up after the collapse of the regime which existed before the Munich agreement was signed. In Poland, fascist aggression prevented the political parties from carrying on their activities.

Not all the former parties championed progress and democracy. Many of them were popular due only to skilful propaganda, generous financial support given by monopoly capital, and the bourgeois politicians' popular demagogic. However, some parties that were linked with the working people entered into an alliance with the Communists and took part in the revolutionary struggle on the workers' side. The BAPU had often taken action against the reactionary regime in monarchic Bulgaria, as is evident from the uprising in September 1923. In prewar Poland, the Democratic Party won the sympathy of progressive intellectuals and other working people by its anti-fascist stand.

In several countries, the progressive traditions of the multi-party system were developed further during the national liberation struggle and the revolution, when many parties (including bourgeois parties) took part in the struggle against fascism and reaction. In Bulgaria, the Fatherland Front (which was illegally set up on the Communists' initiative as early as 1942 and which was guided by the BCP) consisted of the BAPU, the Zveno Union and the Left Social Democrats. In Poland, the radical leaders of the Peasants' Party actively co-operated with the Polish Workers' Party and in 1944 set up the People's Will, which, together with the Democratic Party, later formed the Krajowa Rada Narodowa. In Czechoslovakia, the Communists and the bourgeois parties that opposed fascism set up the National Front. In the east of Germany, the Democratic Bloc was set up on the Communists' initiative in June 1945, after the fall of the Third Reich.

The non-proletarian parties overcame the influence of the ideas of bourgeois democracy and began to build a new society. They helped to carry out important social changes by taking part in united fronts, local and higher representative bodies, the government and other administrative bodies. The non-proletarian parties radically changed their activities because their aim was to draw the broad sections of the working population—peasants, intellectuals, handcraftsmen—into socialist construction.

The historical progressive traditions of the multi-party system are used in the interests of the entire society, when one socialist country after another embarks on building fully developed socialism. The non-proletarian democratic parties are true allies of the Marxist-Leninist parties and help them solve economic, political and ideological problems. In their programme documents and specific day-to-day activities, these parties map out ways and means that would allow various social sections to find their place in society, fully utilise their potentialities and take the road of social progress under the guidance of the working class and its party. At the Eighth SUPG Congress, Erich Honecker said: "The workers' objectively substantiated guidance of socialist society does not do any harm to the position and successful activities of other toiling classes and sections of our people. The tested alliance of the social and political forces of our society will grow yet stronger in future under the guidance of the workers and their party.... The experience gained from our policy of alliance shows that, as before, every step forward must be made together with the partners in the alliance so that they take an increasingly conscientious part in the life of socialist society. Political work must therefore be activated at private and semi-state enterprises. The SUPG will continue to pursue the tested policy of comradely cooperation with the parties and mass organisations that are its allies in the Democratic Bloc and in the National Front."

History shows that the progressive elements of the multi-party system do not always develop adequately. Whenever Right-wing forces that sought to restore the capitalist order seized leadership in the non-proletarian parties and turned them into counter-revolutionary organisations, the multi-party system assumed a reactionary character and its further existence harmed the interests of the working people. A one-party system, therefore, replaced a multi-party system in some countries.

The ability of the non-proletarian political party to take the working people's side during the revolution and socialist construction, correctly understand and consistently play its role in society and acknowledge social guidance by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party is of great importance to the future of the multi-party system in general and to every party in particular.

Many parties which existed after socialist and genuinely popular revolutions were later disbanded because, influenced by fallacious conceptions and guided by Right-wing counter-revolutionary elements, they opposed the working people in the battle between capitalism and socialism. Hence, individual parties were disbanded in some countries, and the multi-party system was abolished in others owing to the historical process and not to a "communist conspiracy". This was true of Soviet Russia and certain other socialist countries.

In Russia, the petty-bourgeois political parties could not stand the test of time due to pre-revolutionary errors. The Bolsheviks often proposed co-operation with these parties on Soviet principles, but their leaders preferred to ally themselves with the bourgeoisie and openly betrayed the people's interests. These parties therefore disintegrated, both ideologically and organisationally, and their supporters among the population broke with them. By 1922, the Soviets no longer had any representatives from petty-bourgeois parties. In the provinces these parties were able to hold out for another year or two and then ceased to exist altogether.

The Bolsheviks initially formed a bloc with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, who were to fill seven posts in the Council of People's Commissars. But the bloc was short-lived. It disintegrated during the conclusion of the Brest Peace Treaty, when the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries opposed Lenin's policy and openly waged an anti-Soviet struggle. Lenin said that the "whole history of revolutions has shown many such revolutionary phrase-mongers and nothing is left of them but stench and smoke".¹

In the People's Democracies, the political parties which defended the reactionaries' interests have also disappeared. In Rumania, this was true of the conspiratorial parties. The National Peasant Party was disbanded by a parliamentary act, and the National Liberal Party had disintegrated by the time this act was passed. In Hungary, the Hungarian Independence Party—a counter-revolutionary grouping headed by Pfeiffer which split away from the Small Farmers' Party—was disbanded. These and other similar parties essentially put themselves beyond the pale of the new society.

Apart from the extreme Right-wing parties which were

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 198.

defeated together with the forces they represented, a group of parties was disbanded after carrying out their tasks at the first stage of the people's democratic system. They fully accepted the communist programme and saw the need to disband themselves. This was true of the Zveno Union and the Radical Party in Bulgaria; the National Popular Party, the Ploughmen's Front and the Hungarian Popular Union in Rumania; and the National Peasant Party and the Democratic Peasant Party in Hungary. The parties which decided to carry on their activities during socialist construction witnessed an intense inner-party political struggle, when the healthy forces, with Communist assistance, overcame the resistance of outspoken and masked reactionaries, purged their ranks, gave the programmes and rules a democratic basis, and took an active part in creatively building socialism. In 1948, the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party, affected by a deep-going crisis owing to the policy of its Right-wing leaders, renamed itself the Czechoslovak Socialist Party to show that it had dissociated itself from the anti-popular policy. The progressive members of the former Democratic Party, which was the reactionaries' bulwark in Slovakia during the establishment of people's democracy, virtually set up a new party called the Slovak National Revival Party. In Poland, all peasant parties merged into the United Peasants' Party after Stanislaw Mikolajczyk's Right-wing grouping had been defeated.

The former bourgeois parties greatly changed, both socially and politically, as they adopted a socialist platform and developed under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The "middle sections", which linked their future with the workers and the toiling peasants, became their social base. Their main task was now to enable these sections actively to participate in socialist construction. The parties took an effective part in the administration of the state and society through their co-operation in public organisations and movements (such as the National Front and the Democratic Bloc), which were guided by the Communists. The former bourgeois parties thus became democratic petty-bourgeois parties.

This was the road taken by two parties in the GDR: the Christian Democratic Union and the Liberal Democratic Party of Germany. Their development is interesting because in the GDR class alliances have assumed a very broad nature. The rich peasants were given the right to join co-

operatives, and private entrepreneurs took part in socialist construction through state participation in private enterprises. The future of these parties, made up of small and middle employers, traders and handicraftsmen, was largely determined by the outcome of the struggle waged in their ranks and especially among their leaders. The purpose of the struggle was to expose the pro-imperialist aspirations of the Right-wing forces, which covered up their real aims by democratic slogans and which tried to re-establish the bourgeois power of the Weimar Republic. These parties which overcame the resistance of the reactionaries, are now helping the urban non-proletarians to take part in building a developed socialist system. This policy is pursued when the state sector prevails in the economy and when the dictatorship of the proletariat is firmly established. This policy therefore influences the social composition of the two aforementioned parties and their political aims.

The struggle against the views inherited from bourgeois society played an important part in the non-proletarian democratic parties' development. Although it was conducted differently in various parties, it improved their work, raised their prestige and consolidated their alliance with the Communists and all the other democratic forces.

The BAPU had to put an end to the erroneous views that some of its members still held on the class nature of the Union and on the need to establish an independent peasant power. Even before the Second World War, these prejudiced views (which were spread by the Right elements) isolated the Union and prevented the peasants from co-operating with the workers and their party. In the people's democracy, the infamous "agricultural" policy was designed to prevent the BAPU from taking part in the Fatherland Front and establishing an alliance with the Communists.

After February 1948, the Czechoslovak Socialist Party's development was characterised by overcoming the pseudo-socialist views of Tomáš Masaryk and Eduard Beneš. These views were a mixture of the social-reformist arguments on supra-class humanism, the possibility of class peace under capitalism and the "national unification" of the exploiters and the exploited. National socialism in its Czechoslovak version was a very important ideological means used by the bourgeoisie against Marxism-Leninism and the revolutionary transformation of society.

Immediately after the establishment of people's power in Eastern Germany, the CDU members still adhered to the concepts of "Christian realism", and the LDPG members, to the concepts of "inborn liberalism". The aim of these two different groups of concepts was to supplant Marxism-Leninism, undermine co-operation between the parties belonging to the Democratic Bloc and essentially to preserve the ideological and socio-economic basis of capitalist society.

The struggle against bourgeois and reformist ideology within the non-proletarian democratic parties, naturally entailed enormous systematic work closely connected with socialist construction. Now when many countries are beginning to build developed socialism, it is still important to take an irreconcilable attitude towards relapses into former views and to be watchful against ideological attacks from anti-socialist forces.

The non-proletarian parties' recognition of the Marxist-Leninist party's leading role in socialist construction played a major part in their development. This recognition was the natural outcome of socio-political development, since all the parties have become convinced that, first, only the Communists have a scientifically substantiated programme of building the new society; second, the programme is in the interests of the working people, who fully support it; third, the Communists are the vanguard of the working class, which is the most progressive, conscientious and organised class in modern society; fourth, the Communists seek to establish broad class alliances and to draw all sections of the working population into socialist construction. In their documents, all the non-proletarian parties declared, sooner or later, recognition of the Marxist-Leninist party's leading role in socialist construction. The two new parties in the east of Germany, the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany and the National Democratic Party of Germany, declared their recognition of this role immediately after their establishment.

Various forms of co-operation between the Communists and the non-proletarian democratic parties, and the latter's participation in social administration, have been tested during socialist construction. These parties and mass organisations belong to the National (Popular) Front in all states with a multi-party system. The non-proletarian parties are repre-

sented in the higher and local state bodies, the government and administrative bodies. In Bulgaria, the National Assembly has 100 members of the BAPU, 280 members of the BCP and 36 non-party members; in Poland, the Sejm has 117 members of the United Peasant Party, 39 members of the Democratic Party, 255 members of the Polish United Workers' Party and 49 non-party members; in the GDR, the Christian Democratic Union, the Liberal Democratic Party, the National Democratic Party and the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany have 52 deputies each in the People's Chamber, the SUPG has 127 deputies and mass organisations have 167 deputies.

What does the future hold in store for the socialist multi-party system? This has been a purely theoretical question in the recent past, but it has become important today, when many socialist countries (including those with a multi-party system) are beginning to build a developed socialist society. It is also important because the multi-party system was at one time supposed to wither away with the development of socialist society.

The multi-party system has now become more or less stable. In recent years, the political structure has not changed much in countries where non-communist parties remained and developed in the second (socialist) stage of the revolution. In Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the GDR and Poland, no parties have been disbanded since the beginning of full-scale socialist construction. This shows that, since then, the multi-party system has developed in keeping with the interests of socialist construction. But attempts to re-establish the multi-party system in countries where it has lost its social importance, or to re-establish disbanded parties are obviously harmful to the cause of socialism. No wonder the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party foiled efforts to restore the non-communist parties that played a counter-revolutionary part in the putsch in 1956. During the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia the forces of the Right tried to restore avowed anti-communist political parties.

The experience recently gained in the class struggle in socialist states has revealed a new trend in contemporary opportunism. Paradoxically, the counter-revolutionary ideologists in Czechoslovakia called for the dissolution of the existing non-proletarian democratic parties in the republic, terming them the "satellites" of the Communist Party. They

argued that account had to be taken of the interests of various sections of the population, and they proposed to abolish the existing institutions of the multi-party system that expressed social requirements. Czechoslovak counter-revolutionaries hoped that the abolition of the multi-party system would give rise to a "plurality of interests" in the communist movement. The authors of the new model of socialism hoped to turn the Communist Party from a workers' party into a reformist organisation of technocrats and intellectuals. They advocated the establishment of a two-party system consisting of the ruling party and the opposition, which could also be a socialist or a communist party. It was held that the communist prospects for social development would remain a "common fundamental constant", and that both parties would not be bound by their class nature and by the defence or denial of this "constant".

The idea of a political opposition is incompatible with socialism, but not because Communists fear competition, as the adversaries of Marxism-Leninism maintain. In socialist society, the Communist (Workers') party is a generally accepted leader of the working people which enjoys great prestige among all the people. The Communists are against the idea of establishing an opposition, because it would not have a social base and would not be supported by any classes. It would be artificial in countries where the population is vitally interested in building and developing socialism. In countries which might have the survivals of exploiting classes, the opposition would merely be a narrow grouping of Right-wing elements seeking to restore the former system. It would thus be hostile to socialism by this fact alone. If such a party were allowed freely to carry on its activities, it would disorganise social life, slow down and complicate socialist development.

Socialist development, which ultimately leads to the full social homogeneity of society, naturally does not create the prerequisites for the extension of the multi-party system and the establishment of new political parties. However, it would be wrong to think that the non-communist parties have no role to play after socialist production relations are established. Even then many economic and especially political and ideological problems still have to be solved with the participation of non-communist parties. Under these conditions, the

multi-party system helps society to develop in every possible way and to consolidate its ideological and political unity and social homogeneity.

5. The Communist Party's Role in the Contemporary Development of Socialist Society

The Marxist-Leninist discovery that the Party increases its guidance as society progresses is of great importance to socialist and communist construction. Anti-communists and Right-wing opportunists fiercely attack this idea. The latter are especially venomous, since it conflicts with their aims to eliminate the "monopoly" of communist power and replace it by "party pluralism", the "free play" of political forces and even a "neutral self-administrative democracy".

The CPSU and the Communist and Workers' parties in other socialist countries proceed from the objective requirements of socialist construction when they develop Lenin's teaching that the Party must play an increasing part in society if the workers want to complete their historical tasks. The revisionists negate Marxist science when they assert that society will develop spontaneously and automatically as a result of its own internal laws after the main tasks of socialist construction are carried out and the socialist basis is laid, and that the Party and other socio-political organisations must merely look after the course of historical development. Marxism-Leninism has nothing in common with subjectivism and voluntarism, which ignore the objective laws of development and call for a short-sighted adventuristic policy.

Under socialism there are no forces that might hinder the operation of socialist laws that are objectively aimed at developing communist social relations. But this does not mean that social consciousness becomes unimportant, for social laws always reveal themselves only through people's activities, which are more effective when the course of development is cognised more deeply. The Communist Party can correctly express objective requirements and satisfy them by its activities and state policy. The 24th CPSU Congress Report said: "Our Party is a party of scientific communism. It is steadfastly guided by Marxist-Leninist science, which is the most advanced, revolutionary science of modern times, and does everything for its further development. Theoretical un-

derstanding of the phenomena of social life and of its main trends enables the Party to foresee the course of social processes, work out a correct political line and avoid errors and subjectivistic decisions."¹

The conditions that determine the law of the growth of the Party's leading role in contemporary society must be briefly mentioned. Social changes become large-scale and more complicated when developed socialism is being built and when the transition is being made to the construction of full-scale communism, i.e., when a firm material and technical basis of society is being laid, when socialist social relations are being consolidated, and when multiform ideological and educational work is being carried out. The scientific revolution in the world is radically changing production and strongly influencing social life. In these circumstances, it is especially important scientifically to substantiate the policy of carrying out further social change by being aware of and applying socialist objective laws in keeping with the specific conditions of each country. The Party, whose policy is based on a scientific interpretation of current social processes, can alone foresee the profound social changes that would be engendered by the revolution in science and technology, and it alone can guide the social forces in making the best use of this revolution's achievements. The Communist Party is carefully analysing the current processes and is using everything valuable in the experience jointly gained in socialist construction so as to work out a strictly scientific and realistic programme for social development and ways of realising it. Unlike social prediction, which has recently become popular in some capitalist countries, the programmes advanced by the Communist parties in the socialist countries are *an appeal and a guide to action*. They are based on strict scientific analysis and are a clear-cut plan for social change in which the broad sections of the people take part. Such documents (Party programmes and the decisions and directives of its congresses) are all-embracing. They clearly determine the main links in the chain of social transformation and take strict account of new trends in various social fields. Leonid Brezhnev has said that the "realisation of the programme for Soviet economic and socio-political development which the Leninist Party has put to the historical test

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 121.

would mean an important change in the world balance of forces in favour of socialism, freedom and peace".¹

The BCP Programme, adopted at the Tenth Bulgarian Party Congress, is mainly a programme for the construction of a developed socialist society. It enriches and interprets the historical experience that has been and is being gained, shows the future trends of the country's development, applies and develops Marxism-Leninism in keeping with the requirements of the new stage of development, and determines and scientifically substantiates the Party's direct historical task and the main ways and means of carrying it out.

The broad sections of the population are today active in politics and labour, and millions of working people take a purposeful part in bringing about social change. Lenin said that socialism is established by popular will and not by a decree from above: "The greater the scope and extent of historical events, the greater is the number of people participating in them, and contrariwise, the more profound the change we wish to bring about, the more must we rouse an interest and an intelligent attitude towards it, and convince more millions and tens of millions of people that it is necessary."²

Therefore, the people's efforts must be pooled, their creative activities must be channelled towards the solution of big problems of social development and general and particular (class, group, local and national) interests must be combined. The Communist Party, which represents and expresses the interests of the progressive class of society—the working class—and all the working people, can alone do this successfully.

The growing importance of communist education of people is another reason why the Party plays an increasing role today. Since communism is the result of the people's purposeful activities, they will take a greater part in communist construction only when they become more conscientious and when their cultural level rises. Ideological education is therefore an important factor of economic, social and spiritual progress.

The Communist Party must continually guide the state and society in their ideological work at a time when, supported by imperialism's ramified propaganda machinery and various anti-communist centres and institutes, the ideological and theoretical adversaries of socialism are trying to distort the aims and essence of socialist development, the principles of Marxism-Leninism and its revolutionary spirit. This ideological work must be scientifically substantiated and properly carried out on a high theoretical level. The events in Czechoslovakia have shown that the Communist Party must always effectively control the mass media and prevent their misuse by the anti-socialist forces.

The Communist Parties carry on ideological work in conformity with scientific principles, especially with the sociological and socio-psychological researches carried out to analyse the results of the appropriate establishments' ideological activities. This helps to eliminate the shortcomings in this work, increase its effectiveness, meet more fully the requirements of the contemporary man—the builder of a new society, and spread Marxist-Leninist views among various social sections and groups in a more differentiated way.

The ideological education of the people is of great importance also because various forms of coercion diminish in importance, and the role of conviction (which must gradually become the main method of guiding socialist society) increases in the society building communism. The Party carries on its ideological work with a view to moulding a harmoniously developed personality.

The work of educating the people ideologically depends upon the degree of Party members' political consciousness. The 24th CPSU Congress Report said: "The Party considers it very important that Communists should perseveringly master the theory of Marxism-Leninism, know the laws of social development, acquire the ability of confidently getting their bearings in the new phenomena of life, evaluate them correctly and draw correct practical conclusions. The ideological steeling of Communists is an indispensable condition for enhancing the militancy of the Party ranks."¹

A correct policy can be pursued, and the Party's social guidance can be effected, only on the basis of the achieve-

¹ *Pravda*, May 15, 1971.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 498.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 124.

ments made by Marxism-Leninism, which becomes more important in all social fields. New social problems can be solved successfully only by making a profound theoretical analysis of all the factors that determine the course of socialist and communist construction, and by carefully studying the experience gained over the years.

Marx, Engels and Lenin knew it was impossible to see the future in detail. Lenin rejected the proposal to include a detailed description of communism in the Second Party Programme, saying that the bricks with which socialism was to be built had not yet been made. The continuers of the cause started by Marx, Engels and Lenin must develop the revolutionary theory and put the guidance of social processes on a higher scientific level.

The CPSU and other ruling Communist parties play an especially big part in developing Marxism-Leninism. In his Report to the Eighth Party Congress, Erich Honecker said that the CC SUPG carried on its ideological and theoretical work mainly to consolidate the leading role of the working class and its revolutionary party. He stressed: "It is aimed at solving the main problems facing the socialist state and developing socialist democracy, and based on the need to make a more detailed study of the economic laws of socialism and planning and managing the socialist economy. Proletarian internationalism and the struggle against imperialism and imperialist ideology are also of importance. The Central Committee believes that our Party's growing ideological and theoretical co-operation with the CPSU and other fraternal parties is of great importance."

The fraternal Communist parties have recently continued to elaborate the basic problems of the world socialist system. The 24th CPSU Congress Report said: "The study and generalisation of each other's experience have made it possible to specify the characteristics of the general laws of socialist construction and reveal more fully the main features of the socialism that has already been built. Particular attention was given to working out the principles of economic integration and other problems arising in the process of co-operation between the fraternal countries and Parties."¹

The Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries tackle the problems of further consolidation of their unity

and their co-operation in socialist construction on a scientific basis in the world arena as well. The meeting of the leaders of the Communist and Workers' parties, held in the Crimea on July 31, 1972, shows that socialist peace-loving policy is grounded scientifically and is effective. At the meeting, they exchanged their views on socialist and communist construction and co-operation between the socialist countries.¹ They were unanimous in stressing that the 24th CPSU Congress Peace Programme is of great international importance. The unity of the socialist community plays a key part in the further progress of socialist society in its advance to communism, in the consolidation and development of the successes scored by the fraternal countries in the world arena. Leonid Brezhnev said that the socialist community was the "bulwark of peace and social progress and the main force opposing imperialism".²

The participants in the Crimea meeting discussed the most important questions of world policy. They stressed that the policy of the socialist countries is instrumental in safeguarding the inviolability of the present European borders, the territorial integrity of states and in achieving an international detente, which involves new fields of international affairs and helps to establish the principles of sovereignty, equality, mutual benefit and non-interference in the affairs of other countries. On the whole, recent events reflect the steady growth of the anti-imperialist forces and the gains made in the struggle for peace and socialism.

The Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries, the world communist and working-class movement owe their successes in the anti-imperialist struggle to their policy of peace, friendship and security.

The Politburo of the CC CPSU highly assessed the results of the Crimea meeting and said that the direct friendly contacts between the leaders of the fraternal parties helped to develop fraternal co-operation between the socialist countries and consolidate the unity of the Communist and Workers' parties in the struggle for Marxist-Leninist ideals and proletarian internationalism.³

The experience of world socialism shows that the Com-

¹ *Pravda*, August 1, 1972.

² *Pravda*, June 28, 1972.

³ *Pravda*, August 18, 1972.

munists must consistently observe Lenin's tenets on the need to consolidate the Party's ties with the working people. The art of Party political guidance implies that a policy that is being pursued must be explained, the appropriate measures taken and the support of the working class and other working people won before a decision is adopted, especially a decision that affects the interests of the broad sections of the population. Lenin said: "Socialism cannot be decreed from above. Its spirit rejects the mechanical bureaucratic approach; living, creative socialism is the product of the masses themselves."¹

The Party must, among other things, co-ordinate social sciences with Party and state work and the solution of the specific problems of communist construction. While guiding the development of the socialist society, the Communist Party blazes the trail of social progress, and attaches great importance to the improvement of the mechanism through which it exercises political power.

Under these conditions, it is especially important for the Party to make a detailed and self-critical analysis of the road it has traversed and its ability rapidly to overcome the shortcomings in, and difficulties of, building a new society. Leonid Brezhnev said at the 24th CPSU Congress: "The experience of past years has convincingly shown that the surmounting of the consequences of the personality cult and also of subjectivistic errors has favourably affected the general political and, above all, the ideological situation in the country."² *Lessons Drawn from the Crisis Development in the Party and Society after the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia*, a document adopted at the Plenary Session of the CC CPCz in December 1970, gives an analysis of the causes of the crisis in the political, economic and ideological fields in Czechoslovakia. The analysis has helped the CPCz to re-establish its Marxist-Leninist nature and overcome the crisis in society.

The implementation of the programme for socialist and communist construction under the Marxist-Leninist party's guidance is in the interests of the workers, peasants, intellectuals and other social groups. The CPSU and the fraternal parties in the socialist community, which are guided by

the laws of social development discovered by Marx, Engels and Lenin, carefully analyse and generalise the achievements and new phenomena in social life, study the experience jointly gained in the struggle for socialism and communism, creatively work out and apply effective forms and methods of guiding socialist and communist construction, enhance the social effectiveness of the political system, and enable an increasing number of working people to take a greater part in socio-political affairs.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 288.

² 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 123.

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

The present epoch is so marked by far-reaching, fundamental transformations in the development of the productive forces that the term "scientific and technological revolution", which struck one not so long ago as being a rather odd new phrase, has now become solidly and universally established in everyday language. What is more, whenever specialists point to the qualitative advances in different areas of science and technology, they often refer to a number of revolutions: the energy revolution, the chemico-synthetics revolution, the cybernetic revolution, the "green" revolution, and so on. New and truly magnificent horizons are opening up before mankind as it becomes possible to solve extremely complex problems involved in exploiting natural resources and producing material wealth.

The scientific and technological revolution and the application of its results have become an important feature of the struggle and coexistence of the capitalist and socialist social systems. Efficient use of the tremendous advantages of the socialist system is acquiring particular importance in this connection. In all respects—economically, politically and culturally—the socialist system possesses all the necessary prerequisites for ensuring qualitative advances in the evolution of science and production and for overtaking even the most highly developed countries of the capitalist world. In his report to the 24th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union Leonid Brezhnev formulated a task of historic significance: organically to fuse the

achievements of the scientific and technological revolution with the advantages of the socialist economic system, and to develop further those forms of linking science and production that are specifically socialist in character.

This is by no means an automatic process, i.e., one that will operate of its own accord. The point is that the development of the society must be properly guided, and the will of its members should be translated into united action. All sections of the population must be helped to understand the targets that have been set and the ways and means of reaching them. Public and labour initiative and activity should be broadened and deepened. All these prerequisites are created and consolidated by socialist society's political system, which is founded and develops on the principles of real and effective democracy. Socialist democracy implies more than just a certain level of economic development: it also guarantees that the scientific and technological revolution will provide working people with maximum satisfaction of their spiritual and material needs, and that it will hasten the complete victory of the principles of communist society.

Under socialism the scientific and technological revolution and democracy are two interlinked and interacting social phenomena which in harmonic unity yield the utmost social effect. To an ever greater extent democracy is being influenced by the scientific and technological revolution, which has important consequences in the most varied spheres of social life. The content, forms and methods of socialist democracy must correspond to the increased scale and complexity of the processes of social management, to the growth of self-awareness and social activity among working people, to changes in the class structure of the population, to the heightened importance of science in the management of society and to the expanding of computerisation in information collection and processing and in administrative decision-making.

Totally alien to socialism are those conceptions which claim that today democracy is an outmoded notion, since it is unable to cope with the complexities of modern life and ensure that society is run skilfully and efficiently. Conceptions of this type depict the broad working masses as lacking social awareness, and as undermining the scientific and rational management of production and society as a

whole. The creators of such notions go on to say that in the age of the scientific and technological revolution all the administrative strands must be brought together and concentrated in the hands of professionals and experts, with democratic institutions being pushed into the background.

Such conceptions produced reverberations here and there in the socialist countries. The only difference was that opportunist ideologists lauded "socialist technocracy", which they saw as replacing democracy. The technocracy idea was connected with attacks on the leading position of the working class, which was said to be an "inert force" and the enemy of scientific and technological progress.

However, socialism differs from capitalism precisely in that it is not only profoundly democratic in its development but also constantly raises the level of the democracy inherent in it and broadens and deepens the principles on which that democracy is based. Communists see in this a reflection of the needs engendered by the revolutionary transformations taking place in the development of the productive forces. Without evolving the principles of socialist democracy it would be meaningless to talk about the enhancement and social effectiveness of state and economic management, about promoting the scientific and technological revolution in the interest of society.

Despite assertions made by opponents of democracy, the democratic process does not mean any averaging of the level of management. Under socialism management policies are devised and implemented not through compromise between progressive scientific thinking and retrograde tendencies, but on the basis of the latest advances in theory and the generalisation and analysis of accumulated experience. This is all the more important since at the present time the relative independence of these policies has become noticeably more pronounced. Acting as a concentrated expression of the economy, they must guide the development of society as a whole. This includes furthering the scientific and technological revolution and making use of its achievements.

Socialist democracy expresses the will and interests of the broadest masses of the people, and at the stage of developed socialism it expresses the will and interests of the whole people. It involves the fullest and most active participation of the working people in managing society, and is,

historically, the highest type of democracy. But how does socialist democracy come to terms with the scientific and technological revolution? How is it the condition and prerequisite for the latter's proper development? What of socialist democracy and the needs arising from the growing complexity of administrative processes and from the necessity of making administration more scientific, more rational and more efficient?

The interaction of democracy and the scientific and technological revolution can already be seen while management policies are being drawn up. Only in a democracy (in the real, genuinely socialist sense) does it become possible to make a sufficiently full and all-round assessment of social interests and needs. Without knowing these, it is extremely difficult to determine the objective tendencies of social development. This means not only the interests and needs of society as a whole, but also those of its constituent classes and social strata. These interests and needs are not ascertained mechanically, but are examined in the light of their links and relationships and against the whole complexity of possible contradictions. In this way the premises for reaching optimum decisions are created and cases of one-sided, over-simplified ideas of the course of social life are averted.

This is particularly important since the scientific and technological revolution forms an integral part of socialist and communist construction. It is linked in the closest possible way with the general economic, socio-political and ideological development of society. The scientific validity and effectiveness of a policy can only be assured if all the elements of social life are correctly identified and assessed, and if the mechanism which combines them into a single whole is revealed.

The democratic organisation of social life also helps management policies that have been drawn up on the basis of a profound analysis of social development to be valued and understood by the broad masses of the working people. As Lenin maintained, the only policy that will succeed is one which enjoys the wholehearted support of the people. Socialism has devised many effective ways and means to involve the working masses in formulating and taking decisions concerning both society as a whole and its separate parts.

Socialist democracy thus presupposes the combination of the genuine rule by the people with a high level of scientific management. This applies also to guidance of the national economy, including those sections of it that require specialised knowledge and skills. It is quite natural that forms of democracy in the area of production should have gained impetus in recent times: in that area the participation of workers and workers' collectives in management has been marked by conspicuous success. The practice of socialism disproves the artificially construed contradictions between science and democracy.

The combination and fusion of democracy, on the one hand, and the scientific approach, rigorous calculation and rationalisation in social management, on the other, are encouraged by constant improvements in the mechanism of management and by its development in accordance with the phenomena that the scientific and technological revolution has ushered into social life. The whole mechanism of social management must be scientific both in terms of the principles underlying it and in the forms and methods of its functioning. Within the mechanism there is no room for subdivision into political and scientific components, since politics and science have always formed a single whole under socialism. With the advent of the scientific and technological revolution, this unity has acquired an even greater significance.

It is the leading role in society played by the Communist Party that acts as the guarantee and absolute precondition for this unity of politics and science and for the conformity of social management to the conditions, needs and trends of the scientific and technological revolution. The 24th Congress of the CPSU and the recent congresses of fraternal parties in the socialist countries laid particular emphasis in their resolutions on the need for Party work at the present level of the development of socialist society to not only take account of all the consequences of the scientific and technological revolution and the opportunities it made available to society, but also to direct its development. The policies of Communists as a ruling party, which have always been noted for their scientific rigour, are today characterised by still greater depth, clarity and precision.

The scientific and technological revolution has particularly demonstrated the need for a comprehensive approach

to the guidance of society, for close links between advances in the development of productive forces and social and political development, and for consideration of the interaction between science and politics, science and culture, and science and education.

The CPSU attaches great attention to the enhancement of the political and ideological activity of the most varied sections of the population, which have been drawn into the processes of the scientific and technological revolution. Of enormous significance is the Party's ideological struggle with anti-communism and modern opportunism, which are looking to the scientific and technological revolution to provide the basis for ideological and political subversion against the socialist system.

It must also be borne in mind that practically all the social and political institutions of socialist society, and primarily the state and public organisations, are involved in implementing the scientific and technological revolution. But the unity, purposefulness and efficiency of the functioning of society's political system can only be assured when the whole system develops under Party guidance.

Creative study of Marxist-Leninist theory, of acquired experience and of social development trends under the scientific and technological revolution is a basis for improving the whole political system and for adjusting the social management mechanism to meet the demands of the times. The scientific and technological revolution necessarily leads to growing complexity in the links between the components of this mechanism, to changes in the functions of the individual parts and to structural transformations within the socio-political institutions. It follows that determining the role and place of each of these institutions and expounding fully the democratic potentials on which they are based are matters that are acquiring supreme importance. With these aims in mind, the CPSU and the fraternal parties have already done a great deal of work which has helped to raise the social effectiveness of existing forms of democracy and to engender new ones (both state and non-state).

Thus during the scientific and technological revolution the state grows in importance. It is unsound in the extreme to reason, as opportunist ideologists do, that the scientific and technological revolution dictates the necessity for freeing society, and especially its economy, from the "shackles im-

posed by the state". If one believes theorists of this kind, then it follows that the upsurge of science, the rapid growth in its role, the harnessing of science for production, the training of specialists, the radical transformations in the sphere of production and other changes associated with the scientific and technological revolution can all happen of their own accord, spontaneously and without any state intervention. Social practice, however, proves the opposite. It provides irrefutable testimony to the fact that it is only with the assistance of the state that socialism can outstrip capitalism in the course of the scientific and technological revolution and the use of its achievements for the benefit of the whole of society.

Under socialism the state acts as a creative and constructive factor in social transformation. Supported by public ownership of the principal means of production and by the great economic potential of the society, the state guides economic and cultural development so as to ensure rapid progress along the path of socialist and communist construction. Moreover, the state has all the means at its disposal to make use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution and to further its development.

The socialist state fulfils its functions on the basis of a thorough understanding of the laws of social development in their interdependence and interaction. This is particularly apparent when it is a matter of forecasting economic development and drawing up both long-term and short-term plans. Forecasting and planning are based on detailed analysis, careful scientific calculation, adoption of the latest statistical methods and the use of computer technology. In the USSR the Ninth Five-Year Plan is already being implemented. Its main task is to ensure a considerable rise in the people's material and cultural living standards on the basis of high growth rates in socialist production, an increase in its efficiency, and scientific and technological progress. In the USSR at the moment the long-term prospects are being mapped out for the country's economic development right up to 1990.

The government's activity is not confined to forecasting and planning: the effective guidance of economic and cultural development is no less important. Of particular importance during the scientific and technological revolution are those functions of the state that are concerned with

promoting science (both pure and applied), using it to improve production methods and developing education and culture so as to keep pace with new demands. In modern conditions this guidance is being exercised in the context of increasingly complex inter-sectoral relations, the enhanced role of co-ordination, the widespread use of computers and automated control systems. It is vital to uphold and perfect the principle of democratic centralism.

Another essential aspect of government activity is that of ensuring that decisions are implemented and supervising the forms and methods to be employed in carrying out the agreed policy. This requires not just formal checking but also efforts to make sure that state planning and management do not lag behind the rapid development of the scientific and technological revolution.

The strengthening of the socialist state and the enhancement of its role in the economy are phenomena which, far from restricting socialist democracy, create the most favourable conditions in which to both broaden and deepen it. Conceptions which oppose the state to democracy and attempt to prove that during the scientific and technological revolution the strengthening of the state inevitably leads to a proliferation of bureaucrats and technocrats and takes power away from the working people do not stand up to close examination. Under socialism the state acts as the main instrument of economic and cultural construction and as the basic, leading form of democracy. On the one hand, the scientific and technological revolution creates the need for reinforcing the democratic processes of the socialist state, and, on the other, it provides all the opportunities, both technological and social, for doing this.

In the running of the state two tendencies are simultaneously developing and interacting: on the one hand, the participation of the masses is expanding and becoming more effective, while, on the other, the scientific principle, the professional element and the rationality of the decisions taken are becoming more pronounced. Technocratic aspirations, supported by the vain hope that any limitations imposed on democracy will be compensated (or maybe more than compensated) by excellence of management, disregard of the growing importance of science and scientifically based methods and means of management, and general incompetence at work—all concealed behind demagogic arguments

about the need to follow the "line of the masses"—are completely alien to socialism. Only by combining the democratic spirit with professionalism in management can decisions be reached that take full account of the complexity of modern social development, and success achieved in implementing them.

The development of the state under socialism takes place in accordance with both political and organisational and technical principles. Experience has shown that, while the political principles remain valid, nevertheless organisational and technical principles are coming to occupy an important place in further improving the state's organisation and activity. These principles involve combining collective and one-man management; devolving power to separate state organs; the correlation between the number of production and administrative and managerial personnel, etc. The scientific and technological revolution underlines the importance of organisational and technical principles of administration.

In fact, democracy should least of all be thought of as an endless succession of meetings, procrastination in decision-making and the absence or dissolution of all responsibility for carrying out the measures agreed upon. On the contrary, socialist democracy guarantees the possibility of rapid decision-making by qualified staff and the setting up of a clear-cut system of rights and obligations which makes it possible to establish personal responsibility for implementing collective decisions. Under socialism democracy also involves a delegation of authority which proceeds from the need to furnish every state organ with the rights and obligations appropriate to its function.

Organisational and technical principles supplement and reinforce political principles, whose substance changes in accordance with the phenomena engendered by the scientific and technological revolution. Of particular importance is the role of the principle of democratic centralism. This must be all the more emphasised, since opportunist ideologists have recently been campaigning against this principle, claiming that it is obsolete and suitable only for the initial stage of socialist construction. Holders of such views have insisted that the scientific and technological revolution calls for unrestrained decentralisation and autarky at local and enterprise level.

However, the principle of democratic centralism is not a temporary measure, introduced for only a short period after the victory of the revolution, but an inseparable feature of the organisation and activity of the socialist state. The scientific and technological revolution has fully preserved this principle, conditioned objectively, as it is, by the essence of the socialist system and by the unity of its political and economic system and of its ideology. Changes are to be seen only in the concrete content of the two inseparable elements of the principle: centralism and the development of the independence and activity of local bodies.

The experience of world socialism shows convincingly that it is essential to uphold and develop creatively both aspects of democratic centralism: centralism and a large measure of local independence. It is important to bear in mind that democracy is inherent in both aspects and is not in the least opposed to centralism. At the present time their interaction and interconditionality, resulting from the nature of the stage reached by contemporary socialist society, are growing in intensity. This is reflected in the delegation of state functions, the balance of rights and duties between the centre and the localities, and the precise area of responsibility assigned to different state organs.

The necessity and extent of centralisation in state administration are determined by the development needs of socialist society; primarily by the need to consolidate its economic potential, which constitutes a single economic complex, and to promote science and its links with production (including the encouragement of basic research and the creation of new industries). Foreign policy factors also have a bearing on the question. An extremely important part is played by the use of the latest administrative methods: a single computerised state system for collecting and processing information, mathematical and statistical models, automated control systems, etc. The objective need for centralisation must not be obstructed by either departmental barriers or administrative boundaries.

Moves in the direction of autarky, the fragmentation of a single national-economic organisation and the predominance of local interests over general ones and the localities over the centre are phenomena which run counter to the interests of socialist society. These tendencies hold back progress in society, in particular, the development of the

scientific and technological revolution, hinder the levelling out of the socio-economic and cultural development of different sectors of society and obstruct the concentration of the means and resources of the whole society in order to solve key development problems.

In addition to this, the development of socialist democracy involves a constant rise in the independence of localities and lower units and the growth of their initiative and activity. In modern conditions, where the scale of economic and cultural construction has increased sharply, where the links between its different sectors have become more complicated, where the numbers of highly qualified staff have expanded and new administrative techniques have appeared, it would be difficult and of little use to solve all problems only at the centre. Modern life demands increased efficiency in state administration, based on knowledge of local conditions and needs and the specific features of regional links.

Nowadays the extension of the area of responsibility of local government organs, the "downward" transfer of authority, is well established in the socialist countries. The principle that each state organ should be granted just the amount of authority necessary for the execution of its duties is being more and more consistently enforced. At the same time improvements are being made to the centralised administration, which retains control of all questions relating to the interests of society as a whole and to the interrelationships of its parts. Today centralised state administration is more and more concerned with long-term planning for socio-economic and cultural development, with ensuring coherence and co-ordination in implementing plans, and with promoting science and its links with production and the life of society as a whole.

The scientific and technological revolution presupposes a more rational approach and greater efficiency in state development. The point is that at the present stage new possibilities and new demands have resulted in the objective need for new state functions, and this need has been met by the appearance of corresponding state organs. The task of simplifying the state machinery remains: duplication and parallelism have to be eliminated, and the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution introduced into administration.

The scientific and technological revolution makes for the development of democracy in all state bodies: in representative institutions, in the machinery of state administration, the maintenance of law and order, in the court of law and the procurator's office and in public control organs. There can be no division of state bodies into democratic and undemocratic ones, since each of them is structured and acts in such a way as to implement the principles of socialist democracy in accordance with its position, the conditions of its functioning, etc. Increased participation of the working masses in running the state is a vital requirement for the development of all its bodies.

All this, however, does not mean that every state body carries an equal "load" in implementing the principles of socialist democracy. On the contrary, the role and tasks of each body are sharply differentiated, although, seen as a whole, they form a single, coherent mechanism. In this respect, the representative bodies, both higher and local, merit special attention.

During the scientific and technological revolution the representative bodies act as the main, leading form of democracy. It is primarily through these bodies that the working people share in the management of society, determine the domestic and foreign policy of their country and ensure control over the work of other state organs. Representative bodies are the basis of the whole state machinery. The role and place of the representative bodies are determined not only by the tasks assigned to them but also by the procedure whereby they are formed, by their legal powers and by the nature of their activities.

In recent years it has become fashionable in some opportunist circles to talk about the decline of the authority and real significance of representative bodies. In particular it is maintained that the scientific and technological revolution and the growing complexity of the processes of social development are making much greater demands on management than hitherto, and the people's representatives, "mere amateurs", as it were, are said to be no longer able to cope. Following the logic of such commentators, the business of management should be handed over in its entirety to professionals, and the people's representatives should, consequently, make way for the apparatus of technocracy.

But is it really true that representative democracy has outlived its usefulness and in an age of scientific and technological revolution seems to be an anachronism that must be immediately replaced by forms and methods of control and administration more attuned to the times? The answer cannot be anything but no. Popular representation, created by the masses in the era of revolutionary upsurge, was and remains a democratic institution which, far from being outdated, is today required to play a more significant role and to perform still more responsible functions in social management.

Under socialism there can be neither legal nor actual contradiction between the role of popular representation as defined on principle and the actual state of affairs. Both in theory and in practice representative bodies are the foundation and the guiding centre of the whole state machinery. This premise is embodied in the constitutions of the socialist countries. It is consistently implemented in social practice.

The scientific and technological revolution under socialism ensures further growth in the authority of representative bodies. This can be explained by the improved social composition of the representative bodies, the higher level of competence for state service that all deputies enjoy, and the strengthened links between the representative bodies and their deputies and the population. Popular representation is developing in a direction characterised, on the one hand, by the concentration of power in the society and, on the other, by the clear distribution of rights and obligations between different units in the representative system and by increasing the independence of each unit. Especially important is the fact that the representative bodies examine and decide fundamental questions associated with the development of society during the scientific and technological revolution.

Popular representation in the form of "working corporations", to use Marx's expression, is displaying its potential ever more clearly. The process is facilitated by the linking of power and professionalism, the setting up of committees and commissions on the basic issues of social life, ever greater reliance on the experience and knowledge of the masses, and the co-opting of highly qualified specialists for consultation and planning work. State and public principles are becoming more closely interwoven in the work of

popular representation, and the ties between representative bodies and public organisations are growing stronger.

As socialist society develops, so the strengthening and improvement of general state administration becomes an objective necessity, and the role of popular representation grows accordingly. The processes of specialisation and fragmentation in various economic and cultural sectors produce at one and the same time the need to reinforce the centralising and co-ordinating principles in the social management system. Both socialist and communist construction requires the integration of different aspects of social life and a comprehensive approach to the outstanding questions of modern times. It is essential to link economic and general social development more closely together and to consider both the technological and social aspects of the scientific and technological revolution.

In the socialist countries it is quite natural that problems, forecasts and long-term plans for socio-economic development should occupy an increasingly greater place in the work of representative bodies. Preparing new Five-Year Plans, which set the pace for present-day socialist and communist construction, and resolving key questions in this construction work both at the centre and in the localities were tasks of crucial importance. The discussion and solution of issues arising from the upsurge of science and technology, conservation of the environment, etc., are producing extremely profitable results.

In recent times representative bodies have noticeably tightened their control over the work of the state administrative machinery. The state of affairs in the most important sectors of public life is reviewed more and more regularly and only after careful preparation at sessions of the representative bodies and meetings of standing committees. Intensifying control is a necessary element in the drive to improve state administration, brought about by the development of professionalism and specialisation in the work of the administrative staff machinery. This guarantees uniformity and a singleness of purpose throughout the activities of the socialist state and ensures that the principled decisions of the organs of popular rule are carried out.

In present-day conditions the representative bodies are being given even broader opportunities to disclose the "duality" of their nature, i.e., as both state and public or-

gans. Above all, the representative bodies are organs which have the plenitude of state power at their disposal: their decisions are universally binding. In order to make their power more effective, the representative bodies can use all the means available to the state to persuade, educate or coerce. At the same time representative bodies act as public organisations, which rely directly on the masses and draw strength from their indissoluble link with them. The reinforcement of both aspects—state and public—is the outstanding feature of the present stage in the development of popular representation.

Quite naturally, the representative bodies are developing as a single system of organs which *in toto* exercise the plenitude of state power both at the centre and in the localities. This is an essential condition for uniformity in mapping out and putting into effect a single political course and in reconciling common and local interests in state activity at all territorial levels. Obviously, though, the uniformity of the representative system does not preclude either the rational distribution of state power among separate levels of the representative system or specificity as regards the forms and methods used by representative bodies belonging to different levels of the system.

A significant feature of the highest representative bodies is the expansion in their legislative activity, which is intended to regulate the most important social relationships. The main point is not the increase in the number of laws, since the figures alone convey little idea of the real growth in the authority of these socialist parliaments. What is important is that the really fundamental questions concerning the development of socialist society and raising the living standards of the working masses are examined and decided by these organs. Thus, among the results of the work of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics over the last few years is the passing of laws dealing with such matters as the long-term planning of the economy, improvements to the public health service, strengthening the family, further modifications to labour relationships, environmental conservation, etc. Important legislative acts have also been adopted in other socialist countries.

Involvement of the broad masses of the people in the activities of the highest representative bodies very often

takes the form of widespread discussion of important pieces of legislation still at the drafting stage. Discussions of this type are a long-standing tradition in the life of Soviet society: the draft Fundamentals of Union Legislation in various legal fields, the Model Rules for Collective Farms and other enactments were submitted for public debate. The draft Constitutions of the GDR (1968) and Bulgaria (1971) were treated in the same way.

The role and significance of local representative bodies have increased perceptibly in recent years. The process was eased along by the extension of their terms of reference, especially as regards territorial planning, agriculture, education, culture and public health. The local popular representative organs perform an important function in co-ordinating the activities of institutions and enterprises not subject to local control but which are situated in their areas. Expansion is taking place in the area of co-operation between local representative bodies and central state organs, which in many cases are directly obliged by law to submit their plans for housing and factory construction for the approval of the people's administration on the spot. The material base of local representative bodies has been strengthened. In a number of socialist countries these institutions have come to be referred to in the Constitutions as organs of state power and self-administration by the people.

The development of local representative bodies yields the desired result only if they remain branches of a single representative system. Trends towards making them excessively autonomous and the opposing of the localities to the centre not only rupture the necessary links and relationships in the system of representation, but also lower the level of state administration. Under socialism local representative bodies do not confine their activities to purely local interests but take an active part in working out and implementing policies that apply to the state as a whole. On the other hand, these bodies do not carry out their specific tasks in isolation from other state organs but with their help and support, which makes for speedy results.

By virtue of their position the local representative bodies are closest of all to the population. They are in permanent contact with the public in their day-to-day business. New forms of mass participation in the activities of local organs of power are appearing all the time in addition to those

already in existence. In a number of countries, for example, regular consultations are envisaged between local representative bodies and the population, and the most important questions will be settled by local referenda.

More effective methods have been selected for encouraging local organs to modernise their economy in tune with the scientific and technological revolution. A considerable number of enterprises which were formerly under central control have now been entrusted to local representative organs. Increasing the self-sufficiency of local representative bodies also means shifting power "from the top to the bottom" and distributing it among them.

During the scientific and technological revolution it is particularly important to stimulate local representative bodies to adopt a comprehensive approach when tackling the problems of economic and cultural development in their areas. This helps to cure a certain one-sidedness of sectoral administration and to ensure full use of local resources. This approach also presupposes effective co-ordination between those involved in tackling questions of local and national importance. In addition, it strengthens the hand of local organs participating in the development of those branches of the economy and culture which are controlled from the centre.

The heightened role and significance of representative democracy during the scientific and technological revolution is supplemented by the modernisation of professional administration, by the reshaping of the system and structure of its organs, by modifications to their areas of responsibility and by improvements to the forms and methods they employ. Rivalry between the people's representation, on the one hand, and the machinery of state administration, on the other, is completely alien to socialism. With close interlinks between all its sections, state administration develops as a single complex, possessing both internal coherence and relative completeness. A characteristic feature of the development of the machinery of state administration is its rationalisation on the basis of the principles of socialist democracy.

In this connection, steps are being taken in the socialist countries to improve the organisation and functioning of the administrative machinery and to raise the efficiency of management in general. The structure, staff policy, technical

facilities and the forms and methods of work in administrative organs are being brought into line with the rapidly changing conditions of social life. This is a complicated and labour-consuming business, and its success depends not only on rationalisation but also on democratisation of the administration. It is clear that the administrative level can only be raised on a democratic basis, taking account of the prospects for democratic development.

Undoubtedly, one of the key factors in improving the administrative machinery is the wider use of computers and automatic systems for both collecting and processing information and reaching decisions and checking on their implementation. In the USSR during the Ninth Five-Year Plan the amount of capital investment in computerisation will increase sixfold. All the socialist countries are seeing a rise in the number of computer centres and automated control systems, which cover both factories and whole sectors of the economy. But no matter how good they are, machines cannot themselves solve the problems of improving and strengthening management. Modern technology calls for a change in the techniques of management (the writing of algorithms and special programmes, automation) and, most important of all, specialists who know how to make the fullest use of it. Thus, automation and mechanisation of managerial processes do nothing to reduce the importance of selecting and placing personnel, but, on the contrary, make this a matter of special significance. This applies not only to the technical staff who actually service the computers, automated control systems and other hardware, but also to a large proportion of administrative workers, especially those in authority.

Needless to say, socialist democracy, far from inhibiting it, actually presupposes the devising of rules and traditions to ensure that the management of society is in the hands of those most fitted to meet the demands of the times. In the new conditions the Communist and Workers' parties are developing Lenin's directions about recruiting and placing staff and are taking due account of people's conscientiousness, their political training, their knowledge of the job and their administrative capabilities. Lenin laid particular emphasis on the competence of administrative staff. He pointed out that a person in authority should both know his job and be an excellent administrator. Today, as never before, the

socialist countries have immense opportunities for ensuring that only highly qualified people, deeply committed to the cause of socialism, enter the administrative service.

It should be borne in mind that in modern conditions, where the concentration and specialisation in production are constantly growing, where science and its practical application are developing and where social processes are becoming more complex, a further increase in the size of the machinery of administration and its staff is an objective requirement for the development of society. This being the case, special importance now attaches to strengthening democratic control over staffing in the state machinery and to further developing the principles that government workers, especially those with a high level of responsibility, must be elected, accountable and removable.

But more than just staff is involved. Close attention in the socialist countries is being paid to improving the internal organisation of the administrative machinery. It is not a question of sporadic campaigns but of serious, sustained work that proceeds along strictly scientific lines and takes account of concrete conditions. In some cases, where there is duplication and overlapping, staff cuts are called for, together with the pruning of superfluous departments. In other cases, where new units and areas of administration appear and the work load increases, new sections and offices have to be opened. It is important to delegate assignments and areas of responsibility in a clear-cut way. The Report of the CC CPSU to the 24th Party Congress makes the point that "every link in the management system must see to its own work to prevent the higher levels from being cluttered up with a mass of minor matters which distract them from the major problems, and to allow the lower levels to deal efficiently with the matters falling within their competence".¹

An integral part of the process of improving state administration and its democratisation is the extension of the principles of collective leadership. Alongside those already in existence, recent years have seen the creation of new collective bodies at the most varied levels of management, including amalgamations of enterprises and agro-industrial complexes. This contributes towards raising the level of

preparatory work, discussion and decision-making, and tightens up supervision over their implementation. Collective leadership forestalls and eradicates the phenomena of subjectivism and voluntarism. It strengthens the link of the machinery of management with non-government organisations of the working masses.

Reinforcement of the principles of collective leadership in the socialist countries goes hand in hand with a rise in the degree of personal responsibility borne by every administrator for the matters entrusted to him. The documents of Communist and Workers' parties stress that collective leadership must not be made the scapegoat for procrastination and formalism in taking decisions, nor must it be reduced to an endless succession of futile meetings. As Lenin pointed out, socialism cannot tolerate even "...the slightest chaos or disorder as regards who is responsible in each individual case for definite executive functions, for carrying out definite orders, for controlling a definite joint labour process during a certain period of time".¹

The development of socialist democracy in the sphere of administration must not be divorced from the reinforcement of state discipline. The meticulous discharging of his duties by each official, no matter what his position, is vital to the smooth running of the machinery of state. The point is that today's administration requires not only high qualifications in its staff, but also precision, self-discipline in their work and strict compliance with laws and other legal directives. It is also extremely important that discipline in administrative workers should be manifested by a conscientious, rather than formalistic, attitude to the matters entrusted to them. They must be capable of creative initiative, quick to react and able to deal efficiently with new administrative problems.

Steps being taken in the socialist countries with a view to enhancing the work of the state machinery include the development of forms of direct working people's participation in running the state and the economy. Under socialism the working people and the machinery of state are not two hostile forces opposing one another (as in a capitalist state), but form a close and indissoluble unity, developing on common social and economic, political and ideological bases.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 212.

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, p. 83.

In a socialist society power belongs to the working people themselves, and they exercise it in various forms, one of which is through the machinery of professional administration. But at the same time the interests of administration in a democracy call for more efficient forms of direct workers' participation in the preparation and taking of administrative decisions and in ensuring that they are put into effect. Consequently, various councils, commissions and conferences attached to administrative bodies are being further developed, as well as sections of the state machinery manned by public-spirited volunteers. The functions of public organisations are similarly expanding.

This process should not be viewed as part of a trend towards replacing professionals by part-timers. In the foreseeable future society will not only be unable to dispense with the services of a special group of people dealing with administration, but it will have to increase their numbers. Even the automation of low-grade administrative work and the streamlining of the state machinery does not lessen society's need for professional administrators. But this makes it all the more important to strengthen the administration's links with the working people, to develop and broaden the working people's participation in carrying out administrative functions and to reinforce the public control over the work of the state machinery.

During the scientific and technological revolution the strengthening of the socialist state is accompanied by a significant growth in the role of non-state forms of democracy. There are, first of all, the public organisations, which occupy a vitally important place in the system of socialist democracy. These organisations have always discharged important functions in connection with educating people for life in society, consolidating collective principles in society and teaching the skills involved in state administration. In the new conditions, where increased demands are being made on production organisations and social life as a whole, where scientific and technological progress and its application depend largely on the training the staff have undergone, their ability to take administrative decisions independently and responsibly, and their interaction and co-operation, and where social principles are becoming particularly effective, the importance of non-state forms of democracy is growing substantially.

The scientific and technological revolution has given special significance to the direct participation of the working people in managing production. A feature of the socialist system from the outset has been the development of democracy in all spheres of social life—in the economic, cultural and educational spheres, as well as in the political one. Democracy in the economy has always constituted a vitally important element in socialist democracy. This has been brought about by the preponderance of public property and socialist economic principles—the essence of socialism. As a result of the increase in the volume and complexity of production processes, the implementation of scientific advances and the reinforcement of workers' interest in both their personal output and the achievements of their collective and of society as a whole, democracy in the economy has become an exceedingly important factor in the social process.

The experience of world socialism shows that working people's participation in managing production yields the greatest returns when it is combined with a state-run economy in which it plays an integral part. In turn, the merits of state planning and administration and the competence of state bodies are supplemented and enriched by the working people's knowledge and professional and life experience. It is important to bear in mind that state planning and administration are not opposed to direct participation by the working people in managing production; they are simply different forms whereby the working class in alliance with the rest of the working population exercises complete political power in society.

Attempts to isolate and remove economic democracy from an integrated system of socialist democracy, to isolate labour collectives and dissipate public ownership of the means of production, turning it into group ownership, run counter to the demands of reality and the interests of the developing scientific and technological revolution. This revolution requires that direct democracy in production should be geared to scientifically based economic integration and centralisation. Equally counter-productive are attempts to ignore the need for the participation of the working people in production management and to introduce technocratic and military-bureaucratic methods of running the economy. This seri-

ously hinders the working people from controlling the production process.

The development of direct participation by the working people in the management of production reflects the spirit of the times also in that it raises efficiency in enterprises, whose independence is manifestly increasing. Strict and systematic control by the working people over the production process, their participation in deciding the main issues of production and the involvement of the whole labour collective in running the enterprise, all make for its success and increase the demands made by the public on the level of management. Thus, in the management of an enterprise both state and public principles coalesce, ensuring that due note is taken of the demands of the scientific and technological revolution in the work of enterprises and in the economy as a whole.

At present various forms of direct participation by the working people in production management exist in the socialist countries. In the USSR it takes the form of trade union participation in deciding economic questions, socialist emulation, production meetings, standing production conferences, working people's cultural associations, collective agreements and comradely courts. All these forms enhance the role of the labour collective, which is the basic unit in socialist society. The 24th Congress of the CPSU stressed the need for a further extension of direct participation by the working people in production management.

During the scientific and technological revolution the socialist system sees a considerable strengthening of the legal status of the individual and of the material, political and ideological guarantees of citizens' rights and freedoms. The scientific and technological revolution is a major stimulus in the historic task of moulding the new man. People in the vanguard of socialist society are scientific and technological innovators, the best production workers and true patriots. The expansion of citizens' rights and freedoms and the consolidation of the guarantees of these rights are a prerequisite of the further development of the scientific and technological revolution, for the new conditions in society and production make ever more rigorous demands of the individual.

The experience gained by world socialism shows that the ruling Communist and Workers' parties must strictly

observe Lenin's propositions on the correlation between general and specific features in building the socialist society. This is also true of the society's political forms. At the 24th CPSU Congress, Leonid Brezhnev said: "Not only are we now theoretically aware but also have been convinced in practice that the way to socialism and its main features are determined by the general regularities, which are inherent in the development of all the socialist countries. We are also aware that the effect of the general regularities is manifested in different forms consistent with concrete historical conditions and national specifics. It is impossible to build socialism without basing oneself on general regularities or taking account of the concrete historical specifics of each country."¹

The socialist states are studying and employing their joint experience. But, contrary to the propaganda of the anti-communist ideologists and Right and "Left" opportunists, they are doing this not to establish a compulsory scheme and a stereotyped pattern of organising the state and its activities. As a matter of principle, Marxism-Leninism opposes the imposition of someone else's experience on any socialist country. Lenin called on all Communists to take a creative approach to existing patterns and to take account of a society's socio-economic and political development, historical traditions, national features and the international situation. He cautioned against imitation and schematism, and said that it was necessary "to seek out, investigate, predict, and grasp that which is naturally specific and nationally distinctive, in the *concrete manner* in which each country should tackle a *single* international task".² Lenin's propositions have been followed in the major documents of the international communist movement, including the document adopted at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1969. It said: "The Communist and Workers' Parties are conducting their activity in diverse, specific conditions, requiring an appropriate approach to the solution of concrete problems. Each Party, guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and in keeping with concrete national conditions, fully independently elaborates its own policy, determines the directions, forms and methods of struggle, and, depending on the

¹ 24th Congress of the CPSU, pp. 9-10.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.

circumstances, chooses the peaceful or non-peaceful way of transition to socialism, and also the forms and methods of building socialism in its own country.”¹

Lenin warned the international communist movement against ignoring socialist theoretical and practical achievements and the experience gained by the parties and countries which were among the first to start building a new society. The aspiration for erroneously conceived uniqueness and the nationalist drive for “priority” are a departure from Marxism-Leninism. These features and processes express the intensification of opportunist trends in society. Isolation in socialist construction can only do harm to society.

According to Marxism-Leninism, the socialist revolution in every country is not only a national phenomenon, but also an event of international importance and a component of the world socialist revolution. The major laws revealed in previous revolutions are therefore inherent in every revolution. Likewise, the forms and methods of socialist construction in individual countries have both specific, national features and general, international ones.

The universal laws of socialist construction, established by Marxism-Leninism and first revealed in the Great October Socialist Revolution, include:

guidance of the working people by the working class and its communist vanguard during the socialist revolution and the entire socialist phase; alliance between the working class and other sections of the working people;

establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of a socialist state of workers, peasants and other working people; the socialist state's continually growing creative role;

a correct, Marxist-Leninist solution of the national question, especially by establishing federations in multi-national states, based on a voluntary consent and equal rights of all nations and nationalities, on the right of nations to self-determination up to secession, and on the principles of democratic centralism and socialist federalism, proletarian internationalism and socialist democracy;

the working people's broad participation in the management of all social and state affairs; the extension of the

principles of democracy from politics to economics and all other social fields.¹

These laws are naturally revealed only through profound economic changes, such as the socialisation of property, balanced economic development and the improvement of the working people's well-being. Denunciation of the general laws of socialist construction and the experience gained by the socialist system will engender nationalism and national exclusiveness and lead to a loss of revolutionary gains.

The Right opportunists' search for an abstract model of “democratic” and “humane” socialism, or “socialism with a human face”, ultimately gave rise to a demand to replace the power of the working class and other sections of the working people that were allied with it by a system of “elite technocratic representative democracy”, where power is exercised on behalf of the working class. The elective state bodies were called the “harmful, direct representation of non-specialists”. They were to be replaced by the administration of experts, and power and administration were to be free of “ideological narrow-mindedness”. Communist Party guidance was to be replaced by political plurality, and the Party itself was to become an organisation of the chosen political leaders standing above the working class. The Right-wing opportunist forces thus tried to “improve” socialism in such a way as to eliminate workers' power and socialist democratic gains.

“Left”-wing revisionism, which is methodologically based on dogmatism, echoes Right-wing revisionism. The dogmatists ignore new phenomena, cling to old formulations and concepts, and try to apply ill-digested Marxist propositions to all countries and all stages of these countries' development. They contend that it is a “revision” creatively to develop Marxism-Leninism and apply it to modern conditions. “Leftist” dogmatists use hard-and-fast formulas to prevent their own country from making progress thus departing from the road of world revolution. The dialectical formula of the general and the particular must not be treated so that only one of its aspects is accentuated. Otherwise, it will harm the cause of socialist construction in a given country and the world communist movement.

¹ *The 50th Anniversary of the Formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics*, pp. 6-7, 16-17 (in Russian).

¹ International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 37.

Despite differences in their programmes and in their methods, Right and "Left"-wing opportunists take the same attitude towards the organisation and activities of a proletarian and consistently socialist type of power. They also have a common aspiration to undermine and eliminate by every possible means the socio-political, legal and state forms which make it possible to exercise this power. They resent the experience gained by the Soviet Union, and falsely accuse the CPSU and the Soviet state of dogmatism and "Soviet revisionism".

The opportunists continue to maintain that Soviet experience is exclusive, that it cannot be applied to other conditions, that it is suitable only for the backward, largely agrarian areas where peasant mentality prevails, and that it is unsuitable for the industrially developed countries which, moreover, have bourgeois democracy. Lenin said that the socialist revolution and socialist construction had its national features in Russia, which at the time was behind the advanced capitalist countries in economic and cultural development. The revisionist theorist Karl Kautsky capitalised on this, contending that the Russian revolution was "unnatural" and "immature", and predicted that it would "inevitably fail".¹ Lenin refuted hard-and-fast dogmas and showed that under specific historical conditions, the workers could and should at first win political power, and then use it for industrial and cultural advance: "If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say just what that definite 'level of culture' is, for it differs in every West European country), why cannot we begin by first achieving the prerequisites for that definite level of culture in a revolutionary way, and *then*, with the aid of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations?"²

The universal laws in a revolution must be perceived, and its importance to the entire world revolutionary movement must be understood before the revolution's achievements are used and its shortcomings taken into account. Lenin went to great lengths to show that "certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national, or Russian alone, but in-

ternational.... Advanced workers in all lands have long realised this; more often than not, they have grasped it with their revolutionary class instinct rather than realised it.... The 'revolutionary' leaders of the Second International, such as Kautsky in Germany and Otto Bauer and Friedrich Adler in Austria, have failed to understand this, which is why they have proved to be reactionaries and advocates of the worst kind of opportunism and social treachery."¹

Bourgeois Sovietologists as well as revisionist ideologists do not understand this. They try hard to show that the Russian revolution did not correspond to what was envisaged by Marxist ideology, and that it was an accident or mistake. Herbert Marcuse holds that Leninism, as the scientific theory and practice of socialist construction, is designed largely for the backward, mainly agrarian countries, and that it does not conform to the present stage of capitalist development. Ernst Fischer, Roger Garaudy and other deviationists from Marxism essentially take the same stand.

Neither the old, nor the new arguments advanced by the ideological and theoretical opponents of socialism can undermine the influence of Soviet example. Soviet experience is of great international importance, as is evident, on the one hand, from the fact that an increasing number of countries are taking the socialist road of development and are widely using Soviet achievements in all social fields, including state development and democracy. In his report to the Eighth SUPG Congress, Erich Honecker, First Secretary of the CC SUPG, said: "The CPSU has been applying the theory of Marxism-Leninism to the problems of the world revolutionary process for over 50 years, and has been using it to build the new social system. It has shown itself to be the most experienced and battle-tested party and vanguard of the international communist and working-class movement. We are drawing from the Soviet Union's very rich theoretical and practical experience, and are applying it in conformity with our specific conditions. We are thus ensuring complete harmony between the general principles of socialist construction and the specific conditions in every country." On the other hand, the Soviet Union—the trail-blazer of socialism and communism—is solving many

¹ K. Kautsky, *Die Diktatur des Proletariats*, Wien, 1918, S. 43.

² V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 478-79.

¹ Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 22.

new difficult problems of social change, shouldering the burden of this, and paving the way for other countries to a bright future.

The CPSU, which is the guiding force of Soviet society and which has gained rich experience in various fields, is doing an enormous amount of theoretical and practical work in studying and generalising new social phenomena, forecasting social development and carrying out in practice sociological studies. It proceeded from the underlying principles of Marxism-Leninism when it advanced, substantiated and approved many solutions to urgent problems facing contemporary socialism, including the development of its legal, socio-political and state forms. At the 24th CPSU Congress, the representatives of the fraternal parties stressed that the Soviet experience is of unprecedented historical importance.

Today, the experience gained by other socialist countries enriches Soviet experience. People's democracy, and other new forms of workers' power which emerged in the mid-20th century, have been developed. This is a practical confirmation of Lenin's prevision that, first, workers' power would be established in different forms with due regard to the specific historical conditions in various countries and that, second, the machinery of this power would be based on and function according to the general laws discovered and formulated as a result of Soviet experience. An important fact is that workers' power was established in both developed capitalist states and backward agrarian countries.

Today, with the establishment of people's democracy, with the victory of the Cuban revolution, one can confidently say that the creative implementation of Soviet experience has enabled the fraternal countries to advance along the road of socialist construction more rapidly, avoid many difficulties and mistakes connected with the search for the most effective ways of building the new socio-political and state system, and thus win time in the historic contest between socialism and capitalism. The Marxist-Leninist parties of the fraternal socialist countries achieved success not by imitating Soviet experience or by mechanically applying ready-made patterns to all conditions, but by studying and applying the general principles of establishing and developing a socialist type of political machinery.

People's democracy was not simply a modification of the Soviet pattern and its adaptation to new historical conditions,

but a special form of workers' power that expressed the specific nature of the transition from capitalism to socialism in the mid-20th century. The countries which took the socialist road had their own inherent features, but the distinguishing features of this new form were immanent in them all. The social factors which gave rise to people's democracy influenced all these countries, though to varying degrees.

Specific revolutionary changes must be especially mentioned in describing the internal factors that predetermined the differences of people's democracy from the Soviet form of workers' power. In the People's Democracies, the revolution proper was, as a rule, preceded by an anti-fascist, national liberation struggle, often involving the use of force. In most countries, the revolution passed through two stages: the general democratic, anti-imperialist (and in many countries, anti-feudal) stage, and the socialist stage. The first stage gradually grew into the second, mainly peacefully. The countries which went through these stages had no civil war, intervention and whiteguard and kulak uprisings, as was the case with Soviet Russia, where the workers' government had to take stringent measures. People's democracy emerged on a relatively broader social basis: the proletariat who from the very beginning was the leader and organiser of the revolutionary struggle, could establish broad class alliances and draw both the peasants and small handcraftsmen, and the "middle sections" to its side.

In countries where the revolution passed through two stages, a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the working people was established at the first stage. This dictatorship was a transitional power which developed the revolution and together with general democratic and anti-imperialist measures carried out certain socialist changes. The dictatorship of the proletariat was established only at the second stage of the revolution. In countries where the revolution was mainly proletarian and socialist from the very beginning, there too the new power gradually transformed the socio-economic and state system on the basis of the experience gained by the Soviet Union.

The People's Democracies developed under more favourable international conditions than the Soviet state. The correlation of forces between capitalism and socialism in the world had changed in favour of socialism. The Soviet Union,

the world's first socialist country, had won the fierce battle against fascism, emerging from the war more powerful and with enhanced prestige. It rapidly overcame the aftermath of the war, stepped up economic and cultural development, and began to play a greater part in the world. This safeguarded the working people in the People's Democracies against attempts at the "export of counter-revolution" and armed intervention by international imperialism. Socialist ideas became an ever more attractive force owing to the changes in the world and the impact of the Soviet example.

The People's Democracies had new socio-political organisations and legal state institutions unknown in the Soviet Union. The working-class's alliance with the peasants, the people's progressive intelligentsia and other sections of the working people assumed the form of a National (Popular, Fatherland, and so on) Front in all the People's Democracies except the Mongolian People's Republic. The constitutions of these countries enshrined the features of the society's economic system, including the peasants' private ownership of land. This private ownership was not abolished even during agricultural co-operation. In many countries the political system had non-proletarian democratic parties. The emergence and development of the forms of proletarian power in the People's Democracies were determined not only by the socio-economic, political and ideological conditions common to all these countries, but also by features that characterised the revolutionary transformation of only a certain group of these countries or even a single country. The prerequisites and stages of the revolution, and the ways and means of establishing workers' power had never been quite the same. The historical traditions and national specific features played an important part in finding the most suitable political and state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat in each country.

When socialism was being built in the European People's Democracies, they had a more or less developed industrial basis, a relatively large number of workers, and certain traditions of bourgeois-democratic political and state life, and the people's cultural level was more or less high. But when socialism was being built in Asian countries, they had not passed through many stages of capitalist development; they had a backward, mainly agrarian economy, a small number of workers, and semi-feudal traditions of man-

agement, and the working people's cultural level was low.

The political systems of the socialist countries differ due mainly to different levels of socio-economic and cultural development, and not to their geographical location. Even the countries situated in the same geographical area differed in the conditions under which the struggle for workers' power was waged and in the forms of establishing this power. In most countries, as we have seen, the revolution passed through two stages, but in some (Bulgaria and Yugoslavia) it only passed through the socialist stage and led to the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In many countries (such as Czechoslovakia and Poland), the embryonic forms of the future people's power arose during the national liberation struggle, and in others (such as the GDR and Hungary), the state machinery began to be set up after fascism had been defeated and the countries liberated. Some countries were, on the whole, one-national, and the unitary forms of their state system therefore did not have any autonomous features. Other countries had several nationalities. They therefore used various forms of national state system, including the federation and various types of autonomy.

The People's Democracies differ in their political and state system due not only to objective factors, but to their Marxist-Leninist party's specific tactics of socialist construction. They even solve similar social problems in their own way. Marxism-Leninism invariably stresses that society can be organised in various political, state and economic forms.

People's democracy as a whole and its different forms developed in keeping with the new social conditions and requirements. As they develop, the People's Democracies gradually lose many features of their state organisation and political system engendered by temporary social circumstances. This is especially true of the political and legal state institutions which were inherited from the pre-revolutionary system and which became increasingly alien to the new system. In several countries the political parties were disbanded which expressed the interests of the social sections which have left the political scene. In countries with a president, the head of state became accountable to the higher representative institution, being deprived of his special powers in respect of the socialist parliament (the right to disband it, approve acts, and so on). More-

over, the organs of the central administration operating in the localities were disbanded as the local elective state bodies' importance and responsibility grew. These and other similar changes helped to consolidate the integrity of the political and state system.

Socialism basically differs from capitalism in that its political system is socially homogeneous, and the system as a whole and all its elements are designed to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat and later the rule of the entire people as this dictatorship withers away. In capitalist society, the polity is rent with profound class antagonisms inasmuch as it includes both the exploiting classes' machinery of power, and the organisations of workers and other working people who are waging a revolutionary struggle against capitalism. This political system therefore develops in an intense class struggle and confrontations between opposing forces.

The situation is quite different when the socialist revolution is triumphant. The elements which prevent the workers (who act in alliance with the other working people) from exercising their absolute power fully are ousted from social life and from the political system as a result of the destruction of the old state machinery, the construction of a new state machinery, and the disbandment of political parties and organisations which, by their class nature, are hostile to the workers and other working people. Society's political system fully coincides with that of the dictatorship of the proletariat, until developed socialism is built.

The disappearance of transient features in the development of the political and state system in the People's Democracies does not mean that the political system is being standardised. In these countries, various forms and methods of exercising power were preserved, and in some countries they were even further developed, as socialist construction advanced. This is attributable to differences in society's political, economic, ideological and spiritual development and the traditions of managing social affairs, on the one hand, and the different ways and means of achieving aims, regardless of the more or less similar approach to the solution of largely similar problems of socialist construction, on the other. The general laws of state construction and the development of socialist democracy are invariably expressed in special national forms.

The Soviet state has traversed a long road and is con-

centrating its efforts on building communism. The forms of political power further improve as world socialism develops. Some specific forms and methods of economic management, of the working people's participation in the management of social affairs, of the Marxist-Leninist party's realisation of its leading role, and of the activities of mass public organisations disappear, and new, hitherto unknown, forms and methods come into being. The historical process thus does not rule out different solutions to political and legal state problems, and does not lead to standardisation and the establishment of stereotyped patterns; it creates the prerequisites for these different solutions on a new social basis. Today, one can rightfully say that there exists a multiformity of political socialist systems which, in keeping with specific social conditions, are developing along the road charted by the trailblazer of socialism and communism, the Soviet Union.